

THE CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—JANUARY, 1868.—No. 39.

ARTICLE I.

CHRIST'S DEATH SUPERNATURAL.

THE death of Christ was *sui generis*. It was different in kind from the death of man. In the evangelical heart there is an almost instinctive feeling that it must have been so, because its atoning value must be found in that difference. Yet this feeling seldom issues into clear discernment and adequate expression; for the voluntariness is generally regarded as the distinctive peculiarity, and treated of so as to leave his death in the sphere of the natural. But unless the death of Christ was supernatural, an act of his sovereign will and power, instead of an event constitutionally inevitable, the Christian system itself can not be consistently defended as supernatural.

It is remarkable that while the other distinguishing facts of Christianity have been apprehended and exhibited as supernatural, this central and fundamental fact, the death of Christ, has been for the most part regarded as an exception. His incarnation and resurrection and ascension are acknowledged by evangelical readers and writers as unquestionably miraculous.

And why should not his death be viewed as equally miraculous? How is it credible that he who was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of a virgin, and spake as never man spake, and wrought signs and wonders by his own power, died merely as a mortal man? To treat his death as on a lower plane than the other great facts of his history, is to mar his history by a sad want of harmony in the facts.

If there is a defect here, it can not have arisen, on the part of those who revere the Scriptures, from any desire or willingness to obscure the exact truth in order to support a system. And yet preconceptions may have predetermined to some extent their interpretations. There is a natural craving for sympathy which may have led men to look too much on the human and too little on the divine in Christ. As similarity of experience is the essential condition to intense sympathy, it is natural to magnify the humanity of Christ at the expense of his divinity. But it should be remembered that exactly the same experiences never enable mankind to make their neighbor's sorrows entirely their own. Though one reason for this is, that the power of sympathy has been weakened by sin, yet another, and perhaps a greater reason is, that perfect sympathy with human sorrow and suffering is possible only in one whose power of sympathy is superhuman. While, therefore, stress is rightly laid upon the sinlessness of Christ in the endurance of his trials, still greater stress should be laid upon the fact that the sufferer was not merely man, but God-man. The great High Priest, whose power to sympathize with man is perfectly adequate, is designated by Paul as "Jesus, the Son of God."

This disposition to view Christ as human instead of divine-human in all his sufferings, has led also to defective representations of his sacrifice. The carefulness to guard the divine person from all participation in the sufferings of the cross, has produced an impression that his atoning work consisted in his torture and his heroism. There is a prevalent habit of discoursing of his sacrifice as a matter entirely within the sphere of the common and the natural. Thus even Barnes, in his comment on Christ's declaration as to laying down his life for himself, remarks: "The patriot dies for his country on the field of battle, cheerfully laying down his life; the merchant ex-

poses his life for gain ; and the Son of God had a right to put himself in the way of danger and of death, when his church and the dying world *needed* such an atoning sacrifice." This can not be the idea of the Gospel. The sacrifice of Christ was no mere risk of life, and no mere loss of life by risk, and had no element of risk in it. It was different also from the sacrifices of the heathen, and even from those of the Jews. These latter were but the dimmest shadowing forth of his. Perhaps there is nothing in the realm of the natural that fitly illustrates it. His allusion to the perishing of the wheat in order to reproduction, was intended as a comforting illustration of the necessity of his death in order to the benefit of mankind, and not as an analogue of his sacrifice itself. It is unfortunate that the peculiar idea of the sacrifice of Christ should be obscured by a wider application of the term. The sacrifice of the God-man must of necessity be different in kind from any that mere man can offer.

This habit of confounding the divine-human with the human, and of hiding the spiritual under the sensuous, may account, in part, for some endeavors to represent Christianity as the religion of nature, and also for some of the violent denunciation of the orthodox view of Christ's death as an atoning sacrifice. Nothing is lost by acknowledging any real responsibility for the errors of others, and something may be gained by any attempt to furnish a corrective. Even the failure of one may suggest the line of success to another. Therefore, as Christianity is the religion of grace and supernatural as a whole, it is proposed to offer some reasons in support of its fundamental element, the death of Christ, as of the same character.

The Scriptures seem to warrant the assertion that Christ was not constitutionally mortal. The authority for this position may be gathered under two considerations.

Christ is represented as the second Adam. This obviously signifies that he was, at least, in no respect inferior to the first man as originally created. No doubt it signifies even some superiority. Manifest equality, however, is enough for the argument. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life ; and man became a living soul." This description is peculiar to the

creation of man, affirming something of his nature which is not affirmed of the animal kingdom. Murphy says :

“ ‘The breath of life’ expresses the spiritual and principal element in man, which is not formed, but breathed by the Creator into the bodily form of man. This rational part is that in which he bears the image of God, and is fitted to be his vice-gerent on earth. As the earth was prepared to be the dwelling, so was the body to be the organ of that breath of life which is his essence, himself.”

This interpretation appears to be valid. The spiritual part of man is the most important, and the physical part does not seem to have been endowed with life until the spiritual was breathed into it. The spiritual essence was thus the ground of the physical life, and made the whole man naturally immortal.

Suitable sustenance for such a being was provided, which he was to appropriate, and thus supplement the superintending care of the Creator. He had free access to “the tree of life,” the fruit of which was fitted to perpetuate the body as the permanent organ of the immortal spirit.

The breath of life which constituted the first man immortal in this completeness, was breathed into his nostrils by the eternal Word, by whom “all things were made,” and “who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God ; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.” Incarnate by a stupendous miracle, Christ was in the likeness of God in the highest sense, “the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person.” If the breath of life from the Son of God made the first man physically as well as spiritually immortal, how much more the eternal person of the Son of God imparted immortality to his human nature. In his case, however, there was no need of any special earthly provision for the maintenance of his immortality ; for he declared to his disciples : “As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.” If the designation of “the Lord from heaven” as “the second man” means anything, that meaning includes the idea of his complete constitutional immortality.

That Christ was not naturally mortal may be shown also from the fact of his sinlessness. Mortality was a part of the curse which God pronounced upon man for transgressing the law of paradise: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." This, however, must not be mistaken for the pre-announced penalty, which was, as Murphy distinguishes, "death in the full compass of its meaning"; while mortality was simply "the formal accomplishment of the warning given." Mortality, then, though not the penalty proper, was yet a judicial, and perhaps also a natural, consequence of the fall. So it was regarded by the apostle, who, in unmistakable reference to the body, used these expressions: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." To secure the fulfilment of this part of the curse, God deprived the transgressor also of all further access to that specific of physical immortality; "lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever."

"From this sentence it follows," says Murphy, "that the tree of life must have had some virtue by which the human frame was to be kept free from the decrepitude of age, or the decay that terminates in death. Its name, the *tree of life*, accords with this conclusion. Only on such a ground could exclusion from it be made the occasion of death. Thus, also, may we meet and answer all the difficulties which physiology presents to the immortality of unfallen man. We have it on record that there was an herbal virtue in paradise capable of counteracting the wear and tear of the animal frame."

The pretentious naturalism of the day may sneer complacently at the notion of the natural immortality of man before the fall; but so much the worse for the naturalism. It has not yet been proved that man was originally mortal; and, what is more, it never can be proved against the word of God which abideth forever. Doubtless the whole animal kingdom was naturally mortal, because the life of the animal was not connected with, and grounded upon, a personal spirit. But man is not an animal. He is not only higher in the scale of being than the highest animal species, but he is generically different.

Another fatal fallacy of those who write up natural science

as exploding divine revelation, is the assumption that the present was also the original constitution of things. They leave out of view the generic change effected in man's moral nature by the fall, and the generic change effected in man's physical nature by the judicial, and perhaps natural, curse which deprived him of the immortality of his original nature, and subjected him to a mortality consonant with his self-induced nature, and symbolic and admonitory of that more comprehensive and awful death which was announced to be the penalty of transgression.

Christ was equal, if not superior, to the first man as originally created in respect to sinlessness. To have been naturally mortal, like the fallen human race, he must have been born a partaker of the fallen nature of the race. He was the Son of man, but not the son of a fallen progenitor whose offspring is inevitably in his own moral image. According to the epistle to the Hebrews, he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners"; separate in the sense of being, as Stuart interprets, "diverse from sinners; unlike to them." Though the Son of God became incarnate after the fall of man and the removal of the tree of life, he was not exposed, by his descent from the virgin, even to so much of the consequences of the fall of the human race as pertains to the death of the body. Absolutely sinless, he was not naturally liable to any disease or decay or deterioration of his physical system, such as ordinarily induces death in mankind. His hungering and thirsting and wearying are to be explained, like his dying, on another principle. In him the spiritual was the ground of the life of the physical, in a far higher sense even than in unfallen man; instead of the life of the physical being the ground of the continuance of the spiritual, as in fallen man. The conditions essential to a natural and inevitable dissolution were entirely wanting. No "length of days" could induce in him the symptoms of approaching mortality. As the God-man he was naturally heir to immortal health and bloom and vigor. He was himself the source of immortality. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." Death was foreign to his nature.

Though this view of Christ's constitutional immortality is thus sustained, it has been missed by many expounders of the Scriptures. Thus Christ's assertion of his absolute self-sacri-

fice is paraphrased by Doddridge into : "I will manifestly show that I lay it down of myself, and voluntarily relinquish my body sooner than my soul would in the course of nature have been dislodged from it." This language essentially perverts and contradicts what it was designed to explain, as it betrays the notion that if Christ had not offered his life voluntarily, he would yet have died by the inexorable law of human mortality. But very little acumen is required to perceive that, if Christ's death could have occurred at all as the legitimate and inevitable result of the course of nature, it really did so occur, notwithstanding his assertion of voluntary and absolute self-sacrifice ! Calvin expounded better, though not so well as he might have done. He recognized the truth that Christ was free from that necessity of dying under which we are laid on account of sin, and yet said : "Christ was born a mortal man ; but this was a voluntary submission, and not a bondage laid upon him." It was indeed a voluntary submission on the part of the Son of God to be born the Son of man ; but, from the showing already made, it is evident that a submission to be born mortal, would have involved a submission to be born a partaker of the fallen nature of the human race ! On the ground that he was the Son of God in union with a human nature, and therefore sinless, it is metaphysically impossible that he should have been naturally mortal. His death was such as no course of nature among mortals will satisfactorily explain. That he was not naturally mortal and yet died, however paradoxical it may seem, is not necessarily a self-contradictory statement. The two factors are entirely consistent, and his death derives much of its significance from the fact that it was not the result of any inherent law of mortality.¹

Christ was also independent of all accident and violence. To this position the inspired testimony is very abundant.

Christ's independence of providential violence lies in the fact of his being the Son of God, "and upholding all things by the word of his power." At his will the wheels of providence roll on their course. The laws of the material universe, which science denominates fixed, were within the control of him at

¹ See Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*. Book II, Chap. xi.

whose secret silent fiat the water was instantly converted into wine, and the few loaves were expanded into a superabundance for the famishing thousands. He had only to speak, and the winds and waves ceased, the sick and the maimed were restored to soundness, and even the dead were raised to life. To his feet the sea was as the land, and to his eyes the darkness was as the light. Lord of life to the universe, he was also the Lord of life to himself. He commanded the forces of the universe, and was independent of their operations. The author of the fixed laws, and the mover of all real and apparent disturbances, his natural immortality as the God-man was without exposure to the slightest danger.

Had the human race remained holy, there had been no violence, and no disposition to any, in the world. But Christ, though sinless, was in the midst of sinful men; and, though harmless and a benefactor, was surrounded by enemies to whom the idea and the means of death were familiar. He was yet omniscient of their hatred and their malicious thoughts and purposes: "Because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." He was also omnipotent to avert the violence threatened, as he often demonstrated by either eluding or thwarting it. He willed, and the traitor and his retinue "went backward and fell to the ground"; nor did they rise till he gave them permission and power. When Peter in rash zeal drew the sword against the mob, Christ immediately, by a mysterious touch, restored to Malchus his amputated ear. Had he chosen, he might have given to the cords with which the soldiers bound him the uncohesiveness of sand. He needed not the sword, and expostulated with his well-meaning disciple: "Thinkest thou not that I can now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" He had power to prevent the scourging and the crucifixion, but forbore to exercise it till he should have occasion to magnify it by a work indisputably greater than coming down from the cross.

Christ was also independent of the power of Satan, the instigator of sin as the occasion of human mortality. The tempter tried all his power upon him without success. He could not induce in Christ the slightest impatience under suffer-

ing, or the slightest thirst for illegitimate glory, or the slightest presumptuousness in departing from, or anticipating, the Father's will. Though Satan was the "strong man armed," Christ was the "stronger than he." At the most critical juncture Christ could say: "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." In his mail there was no joint through which he was vulnerable to "the fiery darts of the wicked." As in the garden of the fall Christ doomed the tempter, so he could always say with authority and efficiency: "Get thee hence, Satan."

With such independence of all providential contingencies, and all intentional violence, whether human or satanic, Christ was justified in saying: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."

If Christ was not naturally mortal, and was independent of accident and violence and danger in the material and spiritual universe, his death was possible only by his own absolute will and fiat.

The common statement of the voluntariness of his death is inadequate, because it involves the implication that, if he had not voluntarily laid down his life, he would have come to his death in some way at some time involuntarily, or against his will. It was not enough that his death should be voluntary, simply in the sense of his dying by his own choice "sooner than he would in the course of nature." Voluntariness of this low degree is scarcely above that which is often exhibited among men.

A man who, in his right mind so far as to be fully responsible, deliberately and purposely destroys his own life, dies voluntarily, and sooner than he would in the ordinary course of nature. He dies still in the course of nature, however, because the law of mortality reigns in him. When he has employed the requisite means of self-destruction, it is impossible for him to arrest the process, however suddenly he may repent his deed, and however strongly he may desire to undo it. No such voluntariness attaches to the death of Christ, who had the power after he was crucified to arrest and reverse the natural effects of the means employed for his destruction. "The energies of life," says Stier, "do not relax, as takes place in us; but in

the power of the spirit there would have been present sufficient energy of bodily life to begin a new life.¹ In him the process and accomplishment of death were equally voluntary with the beginning and purpose. Even Doddridge, who supposed him to be naturally mortal, at the same time understood him as claiming to "have every moment power to rescue himself at pleasure, and even with his expiring breath to command immediate deliverance." Besides, no man has authority to lay down his life at his own pleasure. But Christ had authority to lay down his life at his own will, not indeed wantonly, but in order to take it up again; for he said: "This commandment have I received of my Father."

A soldier may volunteer to do a service in which he supposes his death will be inevitable; and so far his death is voluntary. Yet in such a voluntariness there is always an element of risk just equal to the possibility of escape. Besides, the soldier must die some time and in some way, even though he does not volunteer to die in this way and now. The voluntariness of his death, therefore, does not lift it out of the sphere of the natural, any more than does that of the suicide. No such voluntariness, therefore, must be ascribed to Christ in the laying down of his life. In his case there was no inevitableness and no hazard, for his power to escape was constant and absolute.

The martyr, though arrested against his will, submits to death rather than deny his Lord. So far his death is voluntary. But his voluntariness is not such as to determine whether he shall die or not die at all; it is only such as to determine whether he shall suffer martyrdom at the pleasure of "the powers that be," or be reserved to die in some other way at some subsequent time. It is not such that he would rather die than be set at liberty. It is a conditional voluntariness. He knows that his martyrdom would be only an anticipation of his death as it would certainly take place in the course of nature. He does not know that his death by torture will be aggravated more than it would be in the natural course of events. He only knows that the renunciation of his faith in Christ as his atoning Saviour is too dear a price, and attended with too great

¹ Pope's Translation.

spiritual danger, for deliverance from present death in the form impending, in order to certain death a little later in a form as yet unforeseen. No such voluntariness is at all equivalent to, or like, that of Christ. His includes his will to die upon the cross not only, but his will to subject himself to the unjust condemnation of the Sanhedrim, his will to suffer betrayal by a professing disciple, and even his will to be made flesh. It covered his original and constant purpose, and all the circumstances attending the consummation of that purpose; so that it was unconditional and absolute.

The voluntary death of Christ is sometimes represented as martyrdom, and sometimes distinguished from it as if the difference were simply that he had the power of self-deliverance, while the martyr is powerless. The only adequate view of the voluntariness of Christ's death is that which excludes the implication that his dying was possibly a question of time, and lifts it out of the realm of the contingent and the natural, and makes it dependent absolutely and alone upon his own sovereign will. The voluntariness of his death was not determined or conditioned or affected by the hostile powers engaged in the tragedy; on the contrary, it determined and conditioned the time and the circumstances, the method and the instrumentalities. The question with him was not whether he should die then and so, or at some other time and in some other manner; but whether he should die or not die at all. In the language of Krummacher quoted by Stier: "Above the poor question of mortals, To be or not to be? he is infinitely elevated." And he willed to die; and not only to die, but to die then and so and not otherwise. The voluntariness of his death was different in kind as well as in degree from that of the suicide, or of the patriot, or of the Christian martyr. It was entirely above a possible alternative. It was hinted in the doom of the tempter, and began to be manifested in the incarnation, and was consummated when "being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

His humiliation was voluntary and his own. His obedience to the Father's will, that he should die a sacrifice for sin, was spontaneous and perfect. His dying was within his own power of will, as was his purpose in dying. As the life of his own

spirit was self-existent, and his incarnation was self-assumed, nothing else and nothing less than his own indwelling power could dissolve the connection between the spirit and the flesh. In declaring, "I have power to lay it down," he declared that he alone had the adequate power. As Henry observes: "He had power to keep his life against all the world, so that it could not be wrested from him without his own consent; yet he could when he pleased, slip the knot of union between soul and body." With such indwelling power, it was impossible that he should die except by the exercise of that power; and he would not and could not exercise it except at his own will. His death, as the God-man, was not within the bounds of human possibility; it was possible at all only as "with God all things are possible." That it was possible for him not to die for the time being, that is, at the precise time he did die, seems obvious to all who recognize him as God manifest in the flesh. But obviously the power not to die then was omnipotence, and in omnipotence there was power not to die at all. If it was possible for him not to die, because he was omnipotent, it was consequently impossible for him to die except by virtue of being omnipotent. The possibility of his death was supernatural.

If the death of Christ was possible only by his own sovereign will and fiat, his dying was his own sovereign act. He said beforehand: "Truly the Son of man goeth as it was determined." And after the event Peter spake of "him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." But the Son was a party to that determinate counsel. He came into manifestation not according to natural laws, nor because of any human claims upon him, nor yet with any reluctance, but simply and solely on the prerogative of the God-head, and therefore on his own, to realize mercy to ill-deserving sinners. As a sovereign he counselled and determined, and as a sovereign he came and consummated the divine plan and purpose.

In reference to laying down his life he affirmed: "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." This is commonly understood as meaning that he surrendered himself to be put to death by his enemies, instead of being put to death by them against his will. The interpretation is obviously cor-

rect so far as it goes, but it stops far short of the whole truth; so far, indeed, as to miss the very pith and force of the passage. His enemies, under his permission, did what was in their power to take his life, as they took the lives of the two malefactors. They inflicted wounds and tortures which, if protracted, would inevitably be fatal to mortal man, whose continuance in the flesh was conditioned upon the physical capability of endurance under the pain of crucifixion. But Christ, whose physical capability of endurance under such pain lay in the immortal self-energy of his personal spirit, never succumbed, but "endured the cross, despising the shame," till at his own secret fiat his sufferings ceased, and he could cry: "It is finished." At this stage, however, he had not died. He was still alive on the cross. "Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." He had triumphed already. That cry was his testimony to his triumph. The act of dying was yet to be put forth. "But now we see not yet all things put under him: but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." The suffering of death, for which he was made a little lower than the angels, such agony as men experience in dying, was now past, and "the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." He was now prepared to "taste death for every man," but the dying itself was yet in the future. This distinction between "the suffering of death," as the last and perfect and finished preparation to die, and the "tasting death for every man," as the real act of dying, straightens and illumines a passage generally deemed crooked and obscure, relieves the exact order of the apostle's language from Owen's charge that this "minoration would be no sense at all," and gives a record in accordance with historic fact.

The impression that Christ's death was natural though by violence, except in the mere fact of its voluntariness for the actual time and method, has not of course prevented the ascription of weakness, bewilderment, exhaustion, and intense agony to the experience of Christ during the interval of the cry of triumph and the giving up the ghost. But if the notions suggested by

the observation of human experience are left out of mind, and the pen of inspiration is jealously followed, the dying of the God-man will appear strangely different from the dying of mankind. It were entirely credible that the criminals, under the first torture of the piercing nails, should have cried out in loud expressions of agony; but nothing short of an inspired declaration would make it credible that, after hanging on their crosses for hours, they should have had sufficient strength, the moment preceding their last breath, to cry with a loud voice in giving utterance to their last testimony. But no such witness is borne concerning them. The testimony that Christ uttered that declaration of his complete triumph in a loud voice, is easily believed because he was the Son of God; and forbids the assumption that he still suffered, and that his strength was impaired, and that death was inevitable. On the contrary, it is suggestive of perfect freedom from suffering, of serene repose, of unimpaired capability, of complete and uninterrupted immortality. And thus in the full strength of a life, of which his personal spirit was the ground and source, and with the utmost deliberation, he cried again with a loud voice: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." This language was not prayer, like the expression of the dying Stephen; but the assertion of an absolutely voluntary and unconstrained surrender of his spirit into the hands of the Father; a surrender not in agony, but after the agony was over and finished; a deposit of his spirit as a priceless treasure into the hands of the Father, until the third day. He died in full possession of omnipotence, as if the power of the prince of this world, and of all his hosts, was absolute weakness. He laid down his life, not because of inability to retain and prolong it, but in advance of what was expected by all spectators, and in a way which, rightly apprehended, exhibits his death as far more wonderful than the indefinite prolongation of his life could have been. "Let Christ the King of Israel descend from the cross, that we may see and believe," said the chief priests and scribes. But instead of miraculously descending from the cross, he died upon the cross so miraculously as to astonish his crucifiers, and convince some of them of the true character of their apparent victim, and the true nature of their deed. "When the cen-

turion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said: Truly this was the Son of God." In thus dying, he made the last customary act of violence so palpably unnecessary that even Pilate marvelled. He surrendered his life not to his enemies, but to the Father.¹

In advance of this surrender of his life he said: "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." By power he meant both might and authority. The authority was the commandment he received of the Father, and the might was his own omnipotence. His power was the most comprehensive and the most independent conceivable. It was adequate to die, and to live again, at his will. It was therefore absolutely inalienable. It continued after his death, both in his possession and in exercise; for the same degree of power that was requisite to part the body and the spirit, was requisite to prolong the separation. This is the necessary force of his claim. And he vindicated his claim by rising from the dead. Had he laid down his life in the operation of any natural law of mortality, he could not have resumed it. His dying and his rising he represented as two correlative acts, requiring the same power. His rising was confessedly miraculous. By rising he proved that he was superhuman. In the language of Paul, he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Not that he was raised by the third person of the Trinity, but he rose by the power of his own spirit. If he rose from the dead by the indwelling power of his own personal spirit, he died also by the same indwelling power. If his resurrection was a miracle, his death was a miracle also. The same power was required to lay down his life, as was required to take it again. The angle of reflection was just equal to the angle of incidence. The power which he claimed to possess and to exercise in laying down his life, and in resuming it, not only transcended the power of men and of angels, but was different in kind. In both dying and rising he was not passive like mortal man, but active in as high a degree of energy as when he descended into humiliation, or ascended

¹ For exposition of Luke xxiii. 46, and John x. 18, and xix. 30, see Stier's *Words of Jesus*.

into glory. His dying was his own sovereign act, and by the same divine and supernatural energy which issued the fiat: "Let there be light: and there was light."

It was necessary, moreover, that Christ's death should thus differ from the death of mankind, in order to be sacrificial and expiatory.

Doddridge interpreted the voluntary death of Christ as an anticipation of the course of nature, so also does Van Oosterzee. How then could it have any atoning efficacy? Does the expiatory value of his death consist in his having given himself up to die before his natural time? If his death was the voluntary anticipation of an otherwise natural and inevitable event, it differed not in kind but only in degree from the death of the martyr; and the ignominy of it differed not in kind but only in degree from that of the martyr's; for the martyr, though not absolutely sinless like his Lord, is yet sinless in respect of the offence for which he is executed. It may be said that Christ had power to keep his murderers at bay, and the martyr has not. True, but how were it demonstrable that he had this advantage, unless he had power also to keep death itself at bay, and that forever? Unless his death was different in kind from that of any man, his atonement would consist not in his death but only in the time and the mode of it. One is surprised to find Barnes actually taking this view of the atonement. On John x. 18, he speaks as follows: "He might choose the *time* and *mode* of his death. He died. He chose the most painful, lingering, ignominious manner of death then known to man, and *THUS* showed his love." The italics and the small capitals are his own. Unquestionably Christ chose both the time and the mode of his death: but surely his love did not culminate or find its highest expression in the time and mode. The Scriptures lay the emphasis on the death itself.

"Without the conscious design to overcome and redeem," says Sfier, "the death of Christ would neither be permissible nor possible." As God does nothing superfluous or without an adequate reason, and as without this redeeming purpose there would have been no reason or motive for Christ to die, the remark is true; but it might with equal truth be said that the conscious design to overcome and redeem would be neither

permissible nor possible if Christ were subject to the law of human mortality. Again Stier says: "The second Adam has as such in virtue of his sinlessness the *posse etiam non mori*; if besides this the Son of God in this humanity should die otherwise than voluntarily, in order to obtain life for himself as the Head of many members, in his death there would be neither merit nor power of redemption, . . . but rather an unwarrantably offered, therefore not accepted, yea, even sinful offering for the sins of the world." But the power not to die, surrendered voluntarily, is not enough to give peculiar virtue to his death, unless it be understood as involving also the only power to die sacrificially and vicariously. For in him the power not to die was the natural law of life, and was in spontaneous and constant exercise. For him not to die was natural, but to die was abnormal. Humanly speaking, therefore, greater energy was required in him to die than not to die. Here is the secret of the possibility not only of his redeeming purpose, but also of his atoning death.

The putting forth of his mysterious power to die was necessary in order for the Son to accomplish his divine commission. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." To interpret the material blood of Christ as the ground of remission of sins, is to fail of the true apprehension of his atoning work. His crucifixion was the guilty act of his enemies: his sacrifice was the righteous act of himself. His shed blood was a providential accompaniment, and the natural symbol of his death; but his dying, as his own absolutely voluntary and sovereign act, was entirely distinct from the shedding of his blood. This is made very clear in the ninth chapter of Hebrews. The Levitical sacrifices were offered in the inner sanctuary of the earthly temple by high priests who "were not suffered to continue by reason of death." As these were the figures of the true, the sacrifice of Christ is described in corresponding terms, which clearly distinguish, however, between the natural acts of the earthly priesthood and the supernatural act of Christ. His self-sacrifice was a transaction invisible to men, in an invisible and spiritual sanctuary which material flesh and blood do not inherit or enter. "Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with

hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." This passage places the altar of Christ's self-sacrifice in the spiritual world, and obliges us to understand the offering to be the life which was here manifest in the flesh and therefore in the blood, but which became "a sweet-smelling savor" in the secret pavilion of offended Deity only by eliminating itself from its earthly medium and symbol, and leaving it behind on the cross. Unless his self-sacrifice had been thus supernatural, it would have had no more efficacy for the remission of sins, than the Levitical sacrifices "that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience"; nor as much, for the sphere of his priesthood was not the "worldly sanctuary" but "heaven itself," "the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." He "suffered without the gate," but "through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God," in "the holiest of all." Hence his "blood" is adequate to "purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." His self-sacrifice was the sovereign act of his own eternal spirit, the source of his life in the flesh, and the quickening agent in his resurrection.

There was a necessity that his self-sacrifice should be thus supernatural, in order that he might become our Advocate with the Father. It was essential that he should take up the life which he had laid down, and therefore that he should so lay it down that he might take it up again. As Henry says: "Parting with it by a voluntary conveyance, he might limit the surrender at pleasure, and he did it with a power of revocation; which was necessary to preserve the intentions of the surrender." Had his death been natural, or possible by any law of nature, then by a corresponding law of nature his flesh had seen corruption. But he died assured of "an unchangeable priesthood," assured of "seeing no corruption," assured by his conscious indwelling power to lay down his life and to take it again. The exercise of that power in taking up his self-offered life, consummated his obedience for which he said beforehand: "Therefore doth my Father love me." Had his death been inevitable, his resurrection by the energy of his own spirit had

been impossible. But his body underwent no decay and no deterioration; it lay in the tomb of Arimathea as fresh, and as independent of all destructive agencies or tendencies as was the body of Adam during the interval of its formation of the dust and its immortalization by the divine breath of life. It needed not the spices and aloes of the loving and sorrowing women, but was already embalmed in its own inalienable incorruption and immortality. Death was not Christ's conqueror, but his captive. It had no dominion over him, but he had absolute dominion over it. "It was not possible that he should be holden of it." The power of resuscitation was immanent in his own spirit. He continued dead only by the continued exercise of the same power with which he died. He was the Lord of death because he was the Lord of life. He submitted to the cross as the external means and visible symbol of Satan's power, in order thereby to triumph over him both in the voluntary and sovereign act of dying after the sufferings were past, and in rising from the dead on the third day without having seen corruption. The supernatural rising was conditioned upon the supernatural dying. And that dying was the prerogative of him only who, "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God."

The death of Christ was thus absolutely unique. "There is no man that hath power over the spirit to retain the spirit: neither hath he power in the day of death; and there is no discharge in that war." But Christ had power over the spirit to retain the spirit, and over the body to retain the body; he had power in the day of death, and was discharged in that war as crowned victor. It was his nature to be "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." His death was not a question of time. He could avert every danger, elude all compulsion, control all necessity. He died not according but contrary to the course of nature, not in disease but in health, not in weakness but in power, not in defeat but in triumph, not against but in accordance with his will, not when it was easier to die than not to die, but when it required, so to speak, far less energy not to die than to die. His cry of surrender was not Coverdale's "torment," nor Bullinger's "most bitter pangs," nor Calvin's "painful intensity," nor Barnes' "height of his agony"; but rather Ben-

gal's "*non debilitate ulla, sed cum clamore,*" and Henry's "trumpet blown over the sacrifices," and Olshausen's "full consciousness of Sonship undisturbed," and Stier's "profoundest and most blessed repose after toil—a majestic word of divine authority." To him death was not the "king of terrors." It was not the result of violence and suffering; for he might have caused the nails to leap from the accursed tree, and their prints to disappear from his flesh as instantaneously as he obliterated the gashes of the demoniac, or the blindness of Bartimeus, or the chronic infirmity of the man at the pool of Bethesda. His death was not a process but an act; an act such as only the God-man could perform; in the phrase of Alford, "a determinate delivering up of his spirit to the Father." In the phraseology of the evangelists, he gave up the ghost; in Pauline he died. But his sufferings were finished before the act of dying commenced. The former were preparatory to the latter. The one tested his obedience, perfected him for a sacrifice, laid the foundation for his high-priestly sympathy with mankind on probation; the other propitiated God, expiated human guilt, formed the basis of the possible reconciliation of man to God. Christ suffered while his spirit dwelt in the flesh; and "in that he suffered, being tempted, he is able also to succor them that are tempted." He died when the union of the spirit with the flesh was dissolved; and in that he died he "obtained eternal redemption" for as many as will receive it as his purchase and boon. His death was symbolized by his sufferings, as he was wounded, bruised, led as a lamb to the slaughter, slain, put to death; yet the symbol was not the same as the thing symbolized, since he poured out his soul unto death, gave himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor.

In this view the death of Christ is invested with a sublimity that is consonant with the glory of his character and person. His self-sacrifice is exhibited on the same high plane with his incarnation, his resurrection, and his ascension, and appears as a worthy link in that chain of sovereign acts by which a guilty man may become joint-heir to the throne of the King eternal, immortal, and invisible. The self-sacrifice of Christ was immeasurably more than the martyrdom of the sinless, and was made in a sphere immeasurably above that of the physical and

natural. It was supernatural, and therefore worthy to be the price of the redemption of a lost soul, in comparison with whom the whole world even has no value; of a race made in the image of God but ruined by sin. The atonement of Christ thus appears in its true grandeur, transcending that of creation by as much as the restoration of a sinner to the fellowship of God and to fitness for heaven was more difficult than the preparation of a holy man for a residence in the terrestrial paradise. Its efficacy consists in something more than the mere fitness of suffering under fiendish cruelty to make upon the rational universe a moral impression of God's hatred of sin; for it not only touches the chords of human tenderness and sympathy, but clears the way for God to "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." In his wondrous death Christ did not lose "the power of an endless life," and therefore he became "the first-fruits of them that slept," the power of his resurrection being adequate to clothe their mortality and corruption with incorruption and immortality. So utterly impossible, except by the indwelling power of his own spirit, was the self-sacrifice of the Son of God in human nature, that it is still, to both men and angels, a sublime mystery though an accomplished fact; "the deepest and most stupendous wonder in the history of the Son of God and man."

ARTICLE II.

WOMAN'S PLACE IN RELIGIOUS MEETINGS.

EXPOSITION OF 1 TIM. II. 11-15.

MAN is made the head of the woman. The place of woman, in the family and in society, is one of subjection to man. Man was first formed, and to have dominion of the earth. Woman was formed out of the man, and to be a "helpmeet for him" (Gen. ii. 18), a help as over against him, corresponding to him, or the counterpart of him. The scriptural position of woman is one of subjection to man, both in the Jewish and Christian church. The Jewish religion raised the sex far above her rank among the Gentiles; the Christian religion has greatly elevated her. But Christianity has not changed her position in society. The Scriptures very definitely settle the place of woman, and give reasons for it; and we can plainly discern the propriety of the place assigned her. The divine word alone gives us satisfactory and fundamental truth on this point. It proves itself our guide in this, as well as in most matters both pertaining to this life and to the life to come. We find at the present time the "strong-minded" leaving the teachings of Scripture, and trying to reason out the duty and mission of woman; and they are quite confused by the acknowledged fact that she is the equal of man, and the unquestioned fact also that she is differently organized. The inspired word teaches us; and, in both the Jewish and Christian church of the Scriptures, we find her filling beautifully her proper sphere; and we find few, yet sufficient, regulations and admonitions in regard to her duties and work. She is the equal of man, and his help; in some qualities she is his inferior, in other qualities his superior. She is the counterpart of man; this word fitly expresses her place; so that together, and neither alone, they form one whole, one supplying, in many respects, what is wanting in the other. They are not equal, in the sense that they have both equal rule and authority, but equal in their respective spheres.

The Apostle insists that, as compared with man, she must be "in subjection," she must not "usurp authority over the man,"

she must "learn in silence," "be in silence." There is a seeming harshness, we should say in these days, indelicacy, uncourteousness, in these expressions. But this is according to the truth everywhere taught in Scripture. While the Apostle Paul thus decidedly expresses himself, he always shows his appreciation and honor of women. He associated them with him in his Christian labors. He makes affectionate remembrance of them as his "helpers in Christ." He sends numerous salutations to them in his epistles. He found a most useful place for them in the church. They have always performed with great earnestness and fidelity their duties as members of the church. Though their sphere is more private, they have accomplished at least as great and useful a work as the brethren. Yet the Apostle insists, in this passage and elsewhere, that their place in the church is not as public teachers, nor in any way to act as assuming authority.

What is the place of woman in the church, the passage does not call us to discuss. She filled a most useful and necessary place in the primitive church; as the New Testament and the records of the early church show. But the Apostle here teaches what is not her place: "I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man," but to "learn in silence with all subjection." There can be no doubt that he here refers to her teaching in the church, though it is not expressly stated. He more fully expresses himself, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35: "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak: but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." Now these passages most evidently do not forbid females to take any part in religious meeting, for it is evident that they did exercise their spiritual gifts in the early churches. They prayed and prophesied, and exercised perhaps the gifts of faith, and sacred song, and unknown tongues. But we may judge from the instructions of the Apostle that the more manly and assuming spiritual gifts of teaching, government, miracles, healing, were rarely, if ever, bestowed upon them, or exercised by them. Those spiritual gifts that they did exercise in religious meetings, the

Apostle teaches, should be used in a modest and unassuming manner, becoming the station of woman. Hence he enjoined that, when they prophesied or prayed, they should not do it with the head uncovered: "Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" *i. e.*, in the religious meeting. "Doth not nature herself teach her" this, in giving "her hair for a covering?" "If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."

The reason is given why the woman should not teach nor speak in the church. It is because this would be usurping authority over the man; and her place is to "learn in silence in all subjection." It is because "the head of the woman is the man"; and "the woman is the glory of the man."

These reasons, which the Apostle assigns, together with the general teaching of Scripture in regard to woman's place in the church, will teach us, I think, the meaning of the Apostle in "not suffering a woman to teach." A woman should not take such a part in religious meeting, as shall seem to be assuming authority; she should not be a public religious teacher; she should not put herself forward and make herself conspicuous. She is then forbidden to lead in any of the exercises of public worship. In all large and promiscuous religious meetings, she would be out of her sphere to take part. In the business of the church it is not her place to deliberate, and counsel, and vote, except by courtesy. She is debarred certainly, by the rule of the Apostle, from the ministry, the duties of which belong to men.

Yet in ordinary social religious meetings, the instructions of the Apostle do not forbid her to take part. But they teach her to perform such part, at such times, and in such circumstances, as become the subjection and modesty of her sex.

In meetings where both sexes are present, a responsibility and duty do not devolve upon women to participate in the services, as upon the men. But the teachings of Scripture do not debar her from taking part for the edification and interest of the meeting. So far as she can contribute to make it spiritual, social and enlivening, there is certainly an obligation resting upon her. Christianity has done much for woman, and it is fitting that she bear witness to its power, and speak of her love

to the Saviour. It has cultivated her mental and moral powers, and given her rich inward experience, even superior to man's. She has unsurpassed social powers, a quickness of perception and sympathy, which eminently qualify her for the social, conference exercises of the prayer meeting. She excels in pouring out her heart unto God in prayer, in conversation, in feeling, in nice discrimination, in spiritual experience. Shall she not use these qualities for the enlivening and edification of the social meeting? Shall she not join in the fellowship of Christians with each other and with God? This is not usurping the place of teaching which the Apostle forbids. Her words are certainly more animating and edifying than the stammering, hesitating words of many of the brethren. Men are engaged for the live-long day in the distractions and toils and worldliness of business. It is hard for them to leave these for the atmosphere of the prayer meeting. Woman is shielded from many of these withering and chilling influences. She preserves a more constant communion with God, and a more continual impression of truth. Shall not the social meeting receive the benefit of this? Is it not fitting that she appear there, not merely in silent worship, to help with her inward prayers and feelings, but as an active, living, speaking disciple? May she not communicate, as well as receive? As the Saviour first appeared to woman, after his resurrection, and as they ministered to him during his life, so the Saviour's most precious and intimate manifestations have been to woman. The social meeting is the becoming place for her to testify what the Saviour has done for her.

The prayer meeting is often very thinly attended, is sometimes in the private parlor, or quite as frequently in the kitchen. The church is often very small, especially in its male members. While, too, the brethren are away, engrossed in business, their worldly hearts suggesting that they have no time for the religious meeting, the sisters gather to the place of prayer, as of old they gathered around the cross. The necessity of the case often renders it desirable and proper that the females take part in the exercises of the religious meeting. Many of the small country churches could with difficulty sustain the church meeting and the prayer meeting, without the help of the fe-

male members. Many of the neighborhood prayer meetings could with difficulty be sustained without their aid. If their voices be silent the services will at least be very meagre and dragging and uninteresting. Then, in these small and social gatherings, is it right, that, while free and unrestrained religious conversation is indulged, while assembling, it shall suddenly degenerate into a cold and silent and barren service? Shall such a stupefying enchantment be connected with the announcement: "the meeting is begun"?

Yet, while the Scriptures allow a place to woman in the services of the social meeting, and grace and experience beautifully prepare her for that place, let the teachings of the Apostle not be forgotten. Let her not be assuming. Let modesty, the nice sense of female propriety, govern her conduct, and her mode of using her gifts. Let her not undertake the unseemly part to teach, to dictate, to control. Her place is in the social meetings, and not in the promiscuous gathering, or large assembly; in private, and not in public worship.

But while the place of woman is private, and in subjection, it is most cheerfully conceded that some women are capable and fitted for what others are not. The Apostle gives the general rule. And while the rule should in all cases be regarded, there may be apparent exceptions. Some special mission may at times be given to woman, as to Deborah and Huldah of old. A very prominent and conspicuous place was filled by Mary Lyon and Fidelia Fisk. Some queens have ruled well; and some women have made extraordinary scientific attainments. The sphere of such rarely qualified women is peculiar, yet, if we should closely examine these cases, we should find that even to them the rule of the Apostle applied and very excellently, too. Among the women of Scripture, who assumed very conspicuous places, are Deborah, Huldah, Anna, Miriam, and the daughters of Philip the evangelist. But Deborah, though she was a wise woman and judged Israel, did not go at the head of the army. Huldah was endowed with the prophetic gift; but she does not stand forth prominent in the civil and religious history of the Jews. Anna, though she devoted herself to the service of God in the temple, did not at all go beyond the bounds of female modesty

and propriety. Miriam led the songs of her countrywomen after the triumph at the Red Sea. The daughters of Philip by no means stand forth in any public capacity. The females of the Corinthian church received spiritual gifts; but they appear to have been of a kind befitting their sex; and they were enjoined to use them in a modest and unassuming manner.

The Apostle assigns two reasons why the position of woman is one of subjection.

1. For Adam was first formed, then Eve," verse 13. Adam was made to "have dominion"; Eve, to be a "helpmeet for man." "The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9. She was created therefore, not to lead and bear authority, but to be subject, to take the subordinate place. There must be a head, an order, in the family and in society; and "the head of the woman is the man." 1 Cor. xi. 3. The organization of woman indicates her sphere. She was so "formed," that she is naturally dependent, clinging to the stronger arm of man, controlling by her gentle and winning ways, and her nice discrimination, and her persuasive words, and not by authority and force. She is delicate and beautiful in structure, and not strong; winning, and not commanding, in her bearing. Her place, in the family and in society, is marked by the order of her creation, by the style of her organization, by the kind of her qualities, by the nature of her duties and work.

2. Woman was made to be in subjection, because "Adam was not deceived; but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression," i. e., was first and chief to blame, verse 14. Why did Satan tempt the woman, rather than the man? Because he had reason to suppose that he could more easily prevail. Her nature rendered her more pliable, more easy to be persuaded. She was not formed with those stern and strong qualities that more particularly pertain to man. Therefore she is fitted, not to lead, and command, and reason, and teach, but to be in subjection, to be reliant. Her will is as strong as that of man; but it is controlled by feeling and impulse, rather than by reason. Her emotions are stronger; her understanding is relatively weaker. One suggests the consideration, that

she is not a safe teacher, because at first she was deceived, and led man into sin; and she would be very likely to lead others again into error and sin.

But while this is a proper interpretation of the verse, we must also remember that her place of subjection is in punishment for her guilt in being first deceived. God's curse upon woman was, "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Gen. iii. 16.

But, verse 15, though woman is subject to the man, she receives the full benefits of salvation by Christ; yea, she is entitled to, and has received, a larger portion, "notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity, and holiness, with sobriety." There is no objection to this being received by the pious mother as promise of preservation in the perils of childbirth. But the translation is evidently to be preserved. "She shall be saved through, on account of, child-bearing," *διὰ*. She shall be saved, *σωθήσεται*, not preserved, delivered. It is the appropriate word to signify the salvation wrought by Christ.

"She shall be saved through, on account of, childbearing." The meaning is expressed by Paul in the passage before referred to, 1 Cor. xi. 11, 12: "Nevertheless, neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God." Though the woman was created for the man, yet the man is born of the woman. Her honorable office is to introduce man into the world. By her are children nurtured in their tender years. Some consider that *τεκνογονίας*, in the text, has the meaning of "the nurturing of children"; but "childbearing" is its proper signification; though the word reminds us also of her office in the education of children. It is woman that is earliest and most efficient in forming character. By her is the church increased. Very much does the church owe to pious mothers, to pious teachers, to pious women. Therefore is she equally with man, perhaps we may say, rather than man, entitled to the blessings and privileges of salvation. Together with all the qualities of humanity, she is honored by bearing children, and by giving the first and most permanent impressions to their characters.

Therefore she has specially been honored by her Saviour. With exceeding beauty does religion adorn her character.

Together with this interpretation, and included in it, is the idea: "She shall be saved, through bearing him who is the seed of the woman"; through whom man and woman, and all the nations of the earth, are blessed; by whom alone any one can be saved.

There is a noticeable change of number in this verse. "She shall be saved through childbearing, if *they* continue in faith, and love, and holiness, with sobriety." Not only she who bears children, but all women who exercise these graces shall be saved. The promise is to all the sex on these conditions.

ARTICLE III.

THE APOSTLE PAUL THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

IN the years 1827-8, Prof. Stuart published his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was shortly after reviewed in the *Christian Examiner*, and in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*. In each and all of these publications, the question of authorship was pretty fully discussed. The result was a general satisfaction among evangelical Christians with the commonly received opinion that the writer could have been no other than the Apostle Paul. Unitarians, who have the best reasons for wishing to be rid of this Epistle, were generally satisfied that Paul was not the author, and, of course, that the Epistle is not canonical.¹

Here the subject has rested, so far as American critics are concerned, for the last forty years. But recently the discussion has been revived in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and the writer,

¹ "It is not to be considered as a canonical book, in whatever sense that word may be used." *Chris. Ex.*, Vol. VI., p. 343.

Prof. Thayer of Andover, has, with some hesitation, come to the conclusion that the Epistle in question is not from Paul.¹

Believing, as we do, that Paul is the author of what is commonly called the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that this is a point of great interest and moment in biblical theology, we feel constrained to call the attention of Christians to the evidence, or some portion of it, going to establish this important fact.

But before commencing the argument it may be proper to inquire, if Paul did not write the Epistle to the Hebrews, who did? Who was there in that age, except the Apostle, who could have written it? Some persons have ascribed it to Luke, and some to Clement of Rome. But neither Luke nor Clement were Jews; and obviously it must have been written by a Jew. None but a learned, native Jew, could have had the requisite acquaintance with the Hebrew ritual. Some have thought that it was written by Apollos. But we know not that Apollos ever wrote anything. Certainly there is no writing of his extant, with which to compare the Epistle to the Hebrews, and come to a conclusion as to its authorship. Others have ascribed the Epistle to Barnabas. But if Barnabas wrote the Epistle which bears his name, there is no likeness between this and the Epistle to the Hebrews. And if Barnabas did not write the Epistle ascribed to him, as we are confident he did not, then he has left no writing whatever, with which the Epistle to the Hebrews can be compared.

We come back then to the question: If Paul did not write the Epistle to the Hebrews, who did? It is a strong presumptive argument in support of the claim of Paul to be the author of this Epistle, that we know of no other person living in that age who could have written it.

1. But to come more directly to the matter of proof, we remark, in the first place, the character and circumstances of the writer of this Epistle all agree to the Apostle Paul, and to no one else. As we have intimated already, the writer of this Epistle must have been a Jew, a learned Jew, one perfectly

¹ Prof. Thayer says: "While there are indications in the Epistle itself, indications personal, doctrinal, formal, which suggest the Apostle Paul as its author, there is, on the other hand, much stronger evidence, of all three kinds, against the supposition that he composed it." Further on he says: "Paul can not be regarded as the author of the Epistle." *Bib. Sacra* for Oct. 1867. pp. 705, 714.

acquainted with Jewish institutions and rites. And yet he was a converted Jew, a firm believer in the Messiahship of Jesus, and admirably qualified to unfold the spiritual significance of the Hebrew ritual. Now all this agrees perfectly to the Apostle Paul, and not, in an equal degree, to any other Christian of that age. Again: This Epistle must have been written while the Jewish temple was standing, and its rites were performed; i. e., previous to the year 70, when Jerusalem and the temple were both destroyed. See Heb. viii. 4. At the same time, it was written pretty far down in the apostolic age, when the persons addressed are exhorted to "call to remembrance the former days, when they were first illuminated, and were called to endure a great fight of affliction." They are reminded, too, that, considering the time and privileges which they had enjoyed, they "ought now to be teachers, and not need that one should teach them again what be the first principles of the oracles of God." Heb. v. 12; x. 32. No time can be fixed upon as better conforming to both these intimations, than about the year 63, the very time when Paul is supposed to have written the Epistle. Still again: The author of this Epistle was, at the time of writing, a resident in Italy, and a companion and friend of Timothy. "They of Italy salute you." "Our brother Timothy is set at liberty"; or, as it may better be rendered, is ἀπολελυμένον, sent away. Heb. xiii. 23, 24. The writer had also been a prisoner, perhaps was so still; but was expecting soon to be released. "Ye had compassion on me in my bonds." "Pray for us, . . . that I may be restored to you the sooner." Heb. x. 34; xiii. 19. Now all these circumstances agree to Paul exactly, and so far as we can learn, no one else. He had been a prisoner first at Cesarea, and then at Rome, for about four years, during which time Timothy was constantly near him, except as he was occasionally sent away on missions to the churches.

We mention but another particular in which the writer of this Epistle agrees to Paul. He had not been a hearer or follower of Christ, during his public ministry: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us *by them that heard him.*" Heb. ii. 3. Now Paul, although he had enjoyed

abundant communion with Christ, and received revelations from him after his ascension, had not been, so far as we know, a personal hearer of Christ, during his abode on earth. And the same must have been true of the great body of those addressed in the Epistle; seeing that more than thirty years had elapsed since the crucifixion.

Such then, are some of the expressed circumstances of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, all agreeing precisely to Paul and to no one else, and sufficient of themselves, unless opposed by conclusive rebutting evidence, to identify him as the author of the Epistle.

2. We next appeal to the doctrines of the Epistle to the Hebrews, all which are the same as those of Paul. For example, the superiority of the Christian dispensation to that of Moses, so much insisted on in the first part of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is also set forth in the other Epistles. Paul tells us that the Jewish dispensation is but a type of the Christian, a "shadow of good things to come." Col. ii. 17. He also tells us that the Jewish dispensation, being imperfect, is abolished; but that the Christian dispensation will exist forever. See 2 Cor. iii: 7-18. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, as in all those which are ascribed to Paul, the death of Christ is set forth as the great propitiatory sacrifice for sin, of which the bloody sacrifices of the former dispensation were but the type. It can not be necessary to enlarge on this head. Some of the great doctrines of the Gospel are more clearly presented and more fully explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, than in any other part of the New Testament. Still, they are throughout the doctrines of Paul.

3. The general form and method of the Epistle to the Hebrews are the same as in the acknowledged Epistles of Paul. Under this head we will notice but one particular. The first part of the other Epistles is usually doctrinal and argumentative, while the latter part is practical and hortatory. And just so we find it in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The writer begins to apply and enforce his reasonings at about the middle of the tenth chapter, and so continues to the end.

4. The style of the Epistle to the Hebrews, both in its general characteristics, and in particular expressions, is like to that

of the epistles of Paul. We are aware that the style of this epistle has been urged as an objection to its Pauline origin, but, as it seems to me, without sufficient reason. We admit that the style here differs from that of some of the epistles of Paul, but not more than the subjects of them differ, and the occasions on which they were written. They differ not more than the style of Paul's speech on Mars Hill differs from that on the stairs at Jerusalem; or than that in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia differs from that before King Agrippa. They differ not more than the style of the twelfth chapter of the epistle to the Romans differs from that of the fourth chapter. Whether in speaking or writing, Paul knew how to adapt his topics and his manner of speech to the particular occasion which called him forth; and we might as well insist, from the difference of style, that the speeches and chapters above referred to could not all of them have proceeded from Paul, or that the Epistle to the Hebrews had not the same author as his other epistles.

We said that the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews is, in its general characteristics, very like to that of the epistles of Paul. There is in both a flow and a fullness which can hardly be restrained. The mind of the writer is filled to overflowing; so that if, in the midst of a discussion, an important thought strikes him, he is obliged to go off in a long parenthesis before he can finish the point in hand. We need not refer to instances of this kind in the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Every attentive reader must have noticed them. But we find the same in the Epistle to the Hebrews. As examples of this kind, see chapters iv. 7-9; vii. 21; ix. 9-10; and xii. 20-21. It is impossible for any one to consult these passages, and not see that the style here is precisely that of Paul.

We have equally striking resemblances in particular expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews. We shall be able to notice but a few:

Heb. ii. 4. "God also bearing them witness with signs and wonders." Rom. xv. 19. "Through mighty signs and wonders." 2 Cor. xii. 12. "In signs and wonders, and mighty deeds."

Heb. ii. 8. "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." 1 Cor. xv. 27. "For he hath put all things under his feet."

Eph. i. 22. "And hath put all things under his feet."

Heb. viii. 1. "Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." Eph. i. 20. "And set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places."

Heb. x. 1. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come." Col. ii. 17. "Which are a shadow of things to come."

Heb. xii. 24. "Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant." 1 Tim. ii. 5. "There is one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

Heb. xiii. 9. "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines." Eph. iv. 14. "That we be no more children, carried about with every wind of doctrine."

Heb. xiii. 20, 21. "Now the God of peace . . . make you perfect." Rom. xv. 33. "Now the God of peace be with you all."

The salutations and benedictions at the close of the Epistle to the Hebrews are precisely like those of Paul. "Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you. Grace be with you all. Amen."

Prof. Stuart has given more than sixty examples of agreement between the phraseology of the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of the acknowledged epistles of Paul. The above are but a specimen of them. And yet these are sufficient to show a striking similarity in the language of these epistles.

5. We next proceed to consider the historical testimony as to the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is certain that this epistle was received among the canonical books of the Christians, both in the East and the West, at the close of the first century, or in the very beginning of the second. It is contained in the Peshito, or old Syrian version of the New Testament, and also in the oldest Latin version, both made at a very early period. And what is, if possible, more conclusive, it is quoted repeatedly by Clement of Rome, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, and quoted as having scriptural authority. This Clement was one of the first bishops or pastors of the church at Rome, and a personal friend of Paul, of whom the Apostle says, that his "name is in the book of life." Phil. iv. 3. Living at the very time and in the place where this epistle was written, Clement must have known who wrote it. To be sure, he does not expressly ascribe it to Paul; but since he quotes it as Scripture, and more frequently than any other book of the Bible, he must have regarded it as possess-

ing a canonical authority. But if it had canonical authority, it must have had, as we shall show in another place, an apostolical origin; and to which of the apostles has it ever been ascribed, or can it be, except to Paul?

Accordingly, we have the highest historical authority for ascribing it to Paul. In proof of this, we appeal, first of all, to the Apostle Peter. In the early division of apostolical labor, it was arranged that Paul should go to the Gentiles, and Peter to the circumcision. See Gal. ii. 9. Hence, during the latter part of his public life, Peter seems to have confined his ministry chiefly to the Jews. His first epistle was addressed, not to the native inhabitants of the countries where they dwelt, but "to the strangers scattered throughout" these countries, i.e., dispersed, converted Hebrews or Jews. Chap. i. 1. And the second was addressed to the same people. "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you," the same persons to whom the first epistle was directed. 2 Peter iii. 1. But in this second epistle, Peter tells these converted Hebrews that his beloved brother Paul had written them a letter, a letter addressed to them particularly, in distinction from his other epistles. "Even as our beloved brother Paul hath written unto you; as also, in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things." 2 Pet. iii. 15. It seems, then, that Paul had actually written a letter to the converted Hebrews or Jews, the same people to whom Peter was writing. But where shall we look for this epistle of Paul? Where shall we find it, if it be not our Epistle to the Hebrews? We know not how this argument may strike the mind of others, but to us it seems well nigh conclusive in support of the point we are now considering.

We next proceed to the testimony of the fathers. The immediate successors of the Apostles wrote but little; and their writings were chiefly on particular occasions, and have come to us in an imperfect state. Their allusions to the Epistle to the Hebrews are not decisive, and we pass them over without particular notice. Pantænus was the most learned man of his time, the founder of the celebrated school at Alexandria, who lived within less than a hundred years of the Apostles. In a passage preserved by Eusebius,¹ he says expressly that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews.

¹ Lib. vi., Can. 14.

The successor of Pantænus in the school which he had founded was Clement of Alexandria. He had travelled in Greece, Italy, Palestine and Egypt in quest of knowledge, and at length settled down with Pantænus in Egypt. In an extract from him, preserved also by Eusebius,¹ he affirms that Paul is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Origen, who succeeded Clement in the school at Alexandria, was born about the year 185, and was the most learned of the ancient fathers. He speaks of the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews as differing somewhat from that of the epistles of Paul, and then adds: "If any church holds this to be an epistle of Paul, it is on that account to be commended; for it is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down to us as being of Paul."² The ancients to whom Origen here refers, can be no other than the Apostles, or their cotemporaries.

In the other writings of Origen, he repeatedly and expressly refers to Paul as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Thus, "In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the same Paul says"; and again, "Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews"; and yet again, "Paul, the greatest of the apostles, writing to the Hebrews says."³

Eusebius, the great historian of the ancient church, says: "Fourteen epistles are clearly and certainly Paul's." Of course, he includes the Epistle to the Hebrews; since without it there would be but thirteen epistles. This epistle is often quoted by Eusebius as Scripture, and as belonging to Paul.

It would be superfluous to make further extracts from the fathers of the Eastern church. Dr. Lardner has drawn out a long list of those fathers, all testifying, directly or indirectly, to the Pauline origin of this epistle. It will be enough to transcribe some passages from him.

"The Epistle to the Hebrews is quoted as Paul's by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, in the year 247; by Theognostus of Alexandria in 282; by Methodius in 292; and by Pamphilus in 294. It was received and ascribed to Paul by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in the year 313, and at the same time by Athanasius. In his enumeration of Paul's fourteen epistles, this is placed next

¹ Lib. vi., Cap. 14. ² In Eusebius, Lib. vi., Cap. 25. ³ In Stuart, Vol. i., pp. 109, 110.

after the two to the Thessalonians, and before the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. The same order is observed in the Synopsis of Scripture ascribed to Athanasius. This epistle was received as Paul's by Adamantius, in the year 330; by Cyril of Jerusalem in 348; by Epiphanius in 368; by Basil in 370; and at about the same time, by Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephrem the Syrian, and Didymus of Alexandria. It was received also in this century as belonging to Paul, by Diodorus of Tarsus, by Hierax, a learned Egyptian, by Titus, bishop of Bostra, by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and by the eloquent Chrysostom. In the following century it was received by Severian, bishop of Gabala, by Victor of Antioch, by Palladius, who wrote the life of Chrysostom, by Isidore of Pelusium, by Cyril of Alexandria, by Eutharius, bishop of Tyana, by the ecclesiastical historians, Theodoret and Socrates, and, in short, by all the great writers of the Eastern church down to Photius, John of Damascus, and on to the present time."

In the Western church we have seen that this epistle was received and quoted as Scripture by Clement of Rome, before the close of the first century. It is also found in the oldest Latin versions of the New Testament. Circumstances occurred, however, about the commencement of the third century and onward, tending to bring the Epistle to the Hebrews into disrepute, and cause its canonical and apostolical authority to be doubted of by some of the Latin fathers. It was a favorite dogma with the Montanists and Novatians—which sects prevailed chiefly in the West, that apostates from the Christian faith could never be restored to their former standing in the church. And in proof of this, they relied chiefly on certain passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

"It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." "If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." Heb. vi. 4-7; x. 26, 27.

Instead of removing the difficulty here presented by interpretation, it was thought best by some of the Latin fathers to discard the epistle itself; just as some, at the same period, were for discarding the Apocalypse, on account of the use that was made of certain passages in it by the Millenarians.¹

Irenæus is said by Eusebius to have quoted the Epistle to the Hebrews, but does not expressly speak of it as belonging to Paul. Tertullian thought it was written by Barnabas; and Caius, a presbyter of Rome, about the year 212, in summing up the epistles of Paul, fails to insert that to the Hebrews among them. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, does not quote the Epistle; and Hippolytus, bishop of Ostia, the port of Rome, is said to have discarded it. It was received, however, by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, and by Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, in 354; by Victorinus, a rhetorician of Rome, in 360; by Ambrose, bishop of Milan, in 374; by Philastor, bishop of Brescia in Italy, in 380; by the celebrated Jerome in 397; and by the more celebrated Augustine of Hippo, about the year 400. The authority of Jerome and Augustine seems to have been effectual in reëstablishing the credit of this epistle in the Western churches; as we hear no more of doubts in regard to it, subsequent to this period.

We close our investigation of the historical testimony respecting the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the words of Prof. Stuart: "Not a single witness of any considerable respectability is named in the Eastern church, who has given his voice for rejecting this epistle." In the Western church the testimony is not so unanimous. After having been received at the close of the first century, and the beginning of the second, the epistle was, for reasons assigned, doubted of, or rejected, by a portion of the Latin fathers, until the time of Jerome and Augustine; since which it has been accepted, as of Paul, and as canonical, by the great body of the church of Christ. In view of the whole case, Prof. Stuart adds: "I can not hesitate to believe that the weight of evidence from tradition is alto-

¹ So Luther rejected, for a time, the Epistle of James, because he thought it opposed the doctrine of justification by faith. And Dr. J. P. Smith rejected the Song of Solomon, because, as he said, he "could make nothing of it."

gether preponderant in favor of the opinion that Paul was the author of our epistle."¹

5. We shall urge but another argument to show the Pauline origin of this epistle, and that is, its acknowledged canonical authority, as proved already, near the close of the first century, almost, or quite, in the apostolic age. The early Christians admitted nothing into the canon but what they knew was written by an Apostle, or written under his immediate direction. This, says Prof. Stuart, "is an *articulus stantis vel cadentis auctoritatis*, in respect to the New Testament canon." To be sure, Mark and Luke were not Apostles, but then we are told by the Christian fathers, that the Gospel of Mark was written under the direction of Peter, and the writings of Luke under the supervision of Paul. Eusebius says: "All things in Mark are but memoirs of Peter's discourses"; and Irenæus testifies: "Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the Gospel preached by him." In the Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius, it is said: "The Gospel of Luke was dictated by the Apostle Paul, and written and published by the beloved physician." Luke was Paul's constant companion during his first imprisonment at Rome, and wrote the Acts of the Apostles under his immediate inspection. The Epistle to the Hebrews would never have been received into the canon at the close of the first century, or for the next hundred years, unless it were known to be the work of an Apostle. But if it was the work of an Apostle, who was that Apostle? Can it have been any other than the Apostle Paul?

This argument is as conclusive to our own mind as any moral demonstration can be; and so it has been considered in all ages of the church. Those Latin fathers of the third and fourth centuries, who denied the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, did it for the purpose of getting it out of the canon. And Liberalists of this day refuse to ascribe it to Paul for the same reason. No books, we repeat, were received into the canon by the early church, except such as were known to have been written by the Apostles, or under their direction. The Epistle to the Hebrews was regarded as canonical at the close of the first century, or in the first part of the sec-

¹ Vol. I., p 131.

ond. Therefore it must have been known to be of apostolical origin. But no one of the Apostles can be supposed to have written it, except the Apostle Paul.

The objections to the Pauline origin of this epistle, except so far as they have been already obviated, are twofold. First, Paul did not, according to his usual custom, prefix his name to it; and, secondly, it contains many words and phrases which are not found in the other epistles of Paul.

Two reasons occur to me why Paul did not prefix his name to this epistle. The first is, that it is not throughout so strictly and properly an epistle as in the case of his other writings. It was not addressed to any particular individual or church, but to a class of people, the converted Hebrews in Palestine and throughout the world. In most of its parts it is rather a treatise than an epistle, and did not require the superscription of its author. The other reason why Paul did not prefix his name, is that alleged by Pantæus and Clement of Alexandria, viz.: the prejudices of the Jews, and even of the Christian Jews, against the Apostle. This prejudice was so strong, that many of them during the life of Paul were led to deny his apostleship, which circumstance imposed on him the disagreeable necessity of vindicating it. At a later period, these Judaizing Christians rejected all the epistles of Paul, and regarded them as of no authority. Paul was perfectly aware of this feeling of hostility among his Jewish brethren. Still he felt a deep interest in them, and a desire, if possible, to do them good. It was in the hope of doing them good that he wrote them this epistle, and as a wise man, he would not bar the effort, and preclude the possibility of a good result, by prefixing his name to it. Had he commenced it in his usual style, "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, and Sosthenes a brother, to the believing Jews in Palestine and throughout the world"; he well knew that many of them would not receive it, would not even read it, but trample it under foot. In wisdom, therefore, he withheld his name.

The other objection to the Pauline origin of this epistle is, that it contains many words and phrases which are not found in Paul's acknowledged epistles. This objection is much insisted on by certain German critics; the same which decided,

and on the same grounds, that Moses could not have written the book of Deuteronomy; nor could the author of the book of Job have written the speech of Elihu; nor could the prophet Isaiah have written the last twenty six chapters of the book which bears his name. By the same kind of reasoning, these demolishing German critics have decided that the Homeric poems could not have been written by Homer, or by any one in particular; that Plato did not write several of his dialogues; and that some of the orations of Cicero "could not have been composed by him, either sleeping or waking." The reviewer of Stuart in the *Christian Examiner*, the late Prof. Norton of Cambridge, makes much of the objection we are considering, reduces it to a mathematical form, and decides that "the improbability that Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is about in the ratio of a million of millions to unity." Yet he allows that "if we group together the two epistles to Timothy and that to Titus, we shall find that, in the three, taken collectively, the peculiar words and phrases are still more numerous than in the Epistle to the Hebrews"!!

To test the force of this objection, Prof. Stuart went into a laborious comparison of the first epistle to the Corinthians, with that to the Hebrews, and found that the peculiar words and phrases found in the former were nearly twice as numerous as those in the latter. Vol. I. page 249. With such a result before us, the objection must be regarded as of little worth.

The question as to the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, connected as it should be, and generally has been, with that of the canonical authority of the epistle, is certainly one of great importance. Without this epistle, the Book of God would be incomplete and imperfect. We have enjoined in the Old Testament a great variety of religious rites and institutes—the ark of the covenant, the tabernacle, the altar, the sacrifices, the festivals, the priesthood; and without an interpreter these would be regarded as little more than mere forms.

In fact, by the great body of the Jewish nation, they were so regarded at the coming of Christ. The world needs an interpretation of these institutions; and in the Epistle to the

¹ Chris. Ex., Vol. IV., pp. 512, 529.

Hebrews we have one. I would not say that no light is thrown upon them in other parts of Scripture, but in this epistle, they are opened and made plain to us. We know the import of the ancient priesthood and its bloody offerings; the structure of the tabernacle and temple, the ark of the covenant, the smoking altars and incense, the morning and evening sacrifice, the services of the great day of atonement, all are shown to be full of glorious meaning; and the ritual of the Old Testament, which otherwise would have had no significance, is exhibited as the richest portion of it, the very Gospel of God's ancient church.

Nor is this all for which we are indebted to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In it the great doctrines of the Gospel, the divinity of Christ, his royal priesthood and atonement, and the way of salvation through his blood, are set forth in new lights and with new impression; while its precepts, its warnings, its precious promises, its winning motives, its fervent appeals, are calculated to warm the heart, to quicken the affections, to strengthen the soul for the great conflict of life, and prepare it for the rest and the happiness of heaven. Let us be thankful, then, for the Epistle to the Hebrews—that it comes to us with so convincing evidence, as being of Pauline, apostolical, canonical authority—as the word of God.

ARTICLE IV.

THE OBJECT OF PUNISHMENT IN THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD.

LOOSE views respecting God and his government beget a loose faith and a loose morality. New and subtle influences are working with no little power, throughout Christendom, to unsettle minds respecting fundamental principles of theology. The time for the full fruit of these influences to appear is not yet come. But we are warned by many not uncertain signs

of a prevalent tendency proceeding from them to skepticism and immorality ; hence, there is occasion to examine, and set up again in their places, some of the old, fixed land-marks of truth.

The title to this article suggests one subject about which well defined ideas are needed to meet the moral issues of our day. In its discussion, we shall aim to hold ourselves somewhat rigidly to the one point to be determined, and try to find, through the broad field which it opens before us, a straight course to a sound conclusion.

It is assumed that God has over us a moral government, and that punishment has a place in that government. The question is, what is the object of punishment here? For a broad, general answer, we may say the object of punishment in this, as in every other government, is to subserve the great end of the government itself. The question, then, in order to reach a more precise and particular conclusion, may be resolved into three :

1. For what object is the moral government of God maintained?
2. What is punishment?
3. How does punishment promote the object of that government?

1. The full discussion of the object of God's moral government demands a volume. We can attempt only a brief notice of things bearing directly on our subject. There are two directions in which we may look ; first on the side of the governor and the government and then on the side of the subjects. So it may be said that God has established and maintains a moral government for his own glory. Under any proper conception of God, as a being of infinite perfections, we must suppose that everything he does, subserves his own glory, that this end is distinctly contemplated by himself in the administration of a moral government, and that this is a ground of obligation from which comes a strong appeal for loyalty and obedience on the part of the subjects. But when this is named as the chief end, the final cause of the government itself, the idea of an arbitrary, self-centered, possibly selfish despotism, forces itself on the mind in a way to shock the moral sense. It wakens a suspicion concerning the character of God, a doubt concerning the rightful

supremacy of his government. If there is an ulterior end with which the glory of God is still identified, it will better satisfy all minds.

Again, it may be said that "order is heaven's first law"—that the harmony of the universe, under the supremacy of law, is a good in itself, great and excellent enough to be the chief end of God's moral government. Here, also, we recognize an unquestionable incident or result of a perfect moral government, worthy to be regarded. But the mind can not be satisfied to consider this the grand object of the government. It is as though one, examining the structure and action of a steam-engine, should be all absorbed in admiration of the nice adjustment of its parts and the beauty of its motion, and conclude that the machine was made and is kept running just for the purpose of adjusting parts, combining powers and balancing forces in this beautiful system of harmonious action. In either case reason forbids that we should rest here. The ingenious machine, the wise government, must find its chief end in some object outside of itself to which its action is applied.

Turning then to the other side, it may be said that the highest happiness of the subjects is the end of God's moral government. Certainly, the nearest and most obvious beneficent results of the government appear here and they are glorious and exceedingly precious. But if we present this alone as the chief end, do we not admit a claim that the administration of the government must be conducted so as to secure this result at all hazards? Is it not possible that the honor of the sovereign may thus be compromised and the stability of the whole system imperiled? And may there not arise a conflict of interests among the subjects themselves, the happiness of some involving the misery of others? Is there not some ultimate principle with which the happiness of the subjects is identified, and which defines a way of securing happiness without conflict or collision anywhere?

Then it may be said, again, that the very term government suggests an organized society, and the great object of the government is to adjust the relations and regulate the action of the members of society, so that all shall be protected in the enjoyment of such happiness as each is capable of and entitled to.

A wise moral government will certainly ensure this. It must bring its subjects into a society and make its own authority pervade the society, so as to give ample protection to every member. But all this might be, as in the well-ordered community of a beehive, without developing high moral faculties or illustrating great moral principles, such as must be regarded of supreme importance in the structure and functions of a moral government.

The things we have named must all be embraced or involved in a definition of the true end of God's moral government. But neither is, at the same time, comprehensive and simple enough fully to measure that end. We want a broad, sweeping formula, drawn from the essential nature of moral beings, and of moral government, which shall set forth the one leading idea, the fundamental principle. Dr. Taylor has given us such formula. He says: "The design of a perfect moral government is, so to control the action of moral beings as to secure the great end of action on their part, viz., the production of the highest well-being of all and the prevention of the highest misery of all." This is simple and comprehensive. It brings in, from beyond the range of the previous suggestions, an element which, we can see, may be common to them all. It supposes one great, possible end of moral action on the part of all concerned in a moral government, to secure which the government exists. This will certainly cover the whole field. The glory of God the governor, the stability of the government, the happiness of the governed and their full protection in one organized society, may all be identified with this common end of all moral action.

But is the next step, the defining of that end, quite satisfactory? Does it carry the analysis out to the last possible division? Is his own well-being or happiness the greatest good which a moral being can contemplate for himself? Is the idea of universal well-being as opposed to misery, the grandest possible conception of absolute perfection in a moral universe? Is not moral rectitude rather, the true end of action on the part of moral beings? Is not this the simple radical element of their well-being? Will not right action insure the well-being of the actor, and of all in any way concerned in his action?

Must not every departure from this be itself an evil and necessarily produce misery?

The distinctive characteristic of moral beings seems to require that we take this view. That which distinguishes a moral being from all other beings is the capacity to discern and freedom to choose between right and wrong. It is the noblest capacity we can conceive of. It carries with it a corresponding high susceptibility to happiness or misery. Such a being must experience the purest joy in the conscious love of right and in the very exercise of choice and action in accordance therewith. A conscious opposition to right is itself a misery, and choice and action so prompted can only degrade the being below his true nature. Under the rule of right, harmony prevails and the common highest well-being of all is promoted by the choice and action of each individual. A departure from this rule is the beginning of discord and anarchy, the mischief and misery of which all must suffer.

We say, then, that the true end of action on the part of all moral beings is, moral rectitude as the spring and source of well-being to each and all. Hence the great end of God's moral government is, to illustrate and develop moral rectitude. The glory of God consists in what he is and what he does in this regard. This is the first principle of order in the universe he governs, and the stability of his government depends on the maintenance of this principle. The development of this principle in themselves is the prime element of happiness with all the subjects of that government. And the prevalence of this principle gives protection to all kindred, associated beings, not by the overshadowing power of an external constraint, but through the quickened exercise of the moral faculties of all, and the free interaction of their own spontaneous, concurrent choices. This, then, is our answer to the first question. The government of God is the exponent of moral rectitude. Its object is so to control the action of his rational creatures as to perfect their individual development and secure their common well-being by conformity to this perfect standard.

While the law prevails and the standard is maintained, the government fulfils its object almost unfelt as a government. The attraction of love to the principle and to him who rules by

and for it, anticipates the exercise of authority and the harmony is perfect. But entire freedom of choice is an essential element of the moral faculty. Hence there may spring up somewhere a rejection of the principle of right, resistance to the law, opposition to the government, rank rebellion and a consequent bristling antagonism to the well-being of all. What then is to be done. This brings us to our second question :

What is punishment?

The dictionary says it is "any pain or suffering inflicted on a person for a crime or offence, by the authority to which the offender is subject." We may accept this for a general answer. But let us note the distinct points. It is, first, pain or suffering, a positive experience of anguish in the sensibilities of body or soul, or both ; not the mere negation of enjoyment. It is, second, suffering for crime or wrong-doing. This connection is never to be lost sight of. Innocent suffering is not punishment. If well-doing, through error of judgment or malice be visited with pain, this pain is not punishment in the experience of him who suffers it, whatever may have been the design of him who caused it. The term is restricted to evil felt for evil done. It is, third, pain inflicted, sent with design to be pain, nothing else. It is not a chance coincident, nor a mere natural consequence. Wherever it falls, it reveals the distinct purpose of one who aimed to make the victim suffer. And fourth, it comes by rightful authority. It recognizes a governmental relation which demands of the subject obedience, and clothes the governor with authority to punish for disobedience.

These things are obvious. The nice point, the most important point to be considered, is the relation of the suffering to the crime. We have said it is not mere natural consequence. Penal suffering does not follow wrong-doing just as pain follows the application of one's finger to the flame. Speaking loosely, we sometimes call the pain, in the latter case, the penalty for violating a physical law. But it is really only a consequence, determined by the very constitution of the body. What we call physical laws are but formulas for what we observe to be a uniform order of antecedents and consequents. The order might be changed indefinitely. We should then have to write out the laws differently ; but we can not bring to them a fixed

standard and affirm that the order must be so or so. Moral law, on the other hand, appeals constantly to such a standard. It is fixed and unalterable. Its prescriptions are of no force except as they are right, and every proper subject of moral law is capable of discussing their rightness. The Creator, in his wisdom, might make fingers so that a sensation of pleasure instead of pain should proceed from contact with flame. But no power or wisdom can ever make it right to hate God. The natural consequence of crime is moral degradation; but this is properly no part of the punishment of crime, though suffering may necessarily be associated with it.

Crime, under perfect moral law, is an outrage upon right, a violation of universal purity, a wound inflicted on every heart that appreciates and loves the right. It disturbs the moral balance of the universe. It puts a blot upon the fair face of justice. It strikes a blow at the very heart of goodness and truth. It insults God and breaks the bands of his government. What shall be done about it? To pass it unnoticed will be to let go the principle of right, and dissolve all moral government. Then moral rectitude is universally subverted, and discord instead of harmony, anarchy instead of order, must everywhere prevail. The case admits of but one remedy. It is to concentrate on the heads of the guilty the misery that must otherwise be spread through the whole community. Suffering, the counterpart of his mischievous wrong, must be inflicted on the offender. The moral sense can render but one verdict. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Punishment is thus but the name for suffering inflicted according to the desert of the offence. It carries with it always the idea of satisfaction for wrong. It indicates the immense value, the inviolable sacredness of right on the one hand, and the terrible evil, the abominable loathsomeness of wrong on the other. The relation of the suffering to the crime is that of just desert. By its infliction, the supremacy of right is restored, its excellent glory shines out undimmed by the least blemish, because the offender is dealt with as he deserves, by rightful authority, in the name of right.

A few words will make it plainly appear, in the last place, how punishment promotes the end of moral government. It is not by reforming the criminal. That is not at all the

office of punishment as such. If a place is opened for the introduction of mercy in a perfect, moral government, mercy may use suffering in the way of chastisement for reformation. But while she is working her healthful discipline, punishment is stayed. That suffering is not punishment; nay, we may say that the effectiveness of that merciful chastening depends on the recognition of the true character and place of punishment, and the certainty that if the chastening fails of its end, punishment must come and, in its way, fulfil the great end of a moral government.

Nor does punishment promote the end of a moral government by affording protection to the members of the society which the government recognizes and rules. Incidentally it helps that result; but it is not inflicted merely or mainly as a means of retaining or putting out of the way the mischievous criminals of society. The safeguard for protection lies in the clear perception and the strong love of right itself, on the part of all moral beings. The example of punishment may help to clear up that perception and strengthen that love, and so incidentally serve this purpose. Yet its power to do this depends, also, on the recognition of its true character and place—on the actual fulfillment of its specific purpose. This leads us to say positively that punishment serves the great end of a moral government, as it vindicates right and sustains the principle of moral rectitude universally, by taking actual satisfaction for wrong done, rendering to the wrong doer that which he deserves. The supremacy of right violated is restored when, by the authority of the government, the guilty are made to suffer what it is right they should suffer for their crimes.

This, then, is the true answer to our main question: "The object of punishment in the government of God is to express and inflict the real desert of sin."

This view accords with the constitution of the soul. Every rational being is made to take up the idea of absolute right and legitimate supremacy of right, by intuition, just as it takes up the idea of space and duration and the necessary connection of cause and effect. This idea expands with the unfolding intelligence. No perversion of conduct from the rule of right, no corruption of the soul under a cherished hostility to right

can destroy the principle. Though slighted and trampled on, it lives in the soul of even the most depraved, as an apprehension, on occasions at least, of the essential beauty and excellence of moral rectitude, and as a fear of a visitation of suffering according to desert for sin. It prompts the instinctive verdict, on the perpetration of a great crime, that great suffering ought to be inflicted on the offender.

The very etymology of the word punishment makes it significant of this natural sentiment. It is derived from the Greek *ποινή*, "the money price paid by the man-slayer as a substitute for the suffering which his crime demanded." So in all ages, among all races and nations, satisfaction in some way to be rendered for wrong done, appears an essential feature of punishment. Hence comes the peculiar customs of the early Greeks, of the barbarians of the middle age and of modern savages, respecting commutations for crime. The child catches this idea instinctively, with his early conceptions of wrong. Under a consciousness of ill-desert, he will come to his parent, after committing a fault, and actually call for the punishment due, as though it were a relief to his own moral sense to give satisfaction in that way. Thus Plato represents Socrates as teaching that to be wronged is better than to do wrong, and having done wrong, to be punished for it is better than to go unpunished, because a just punishment supposes the one punished to suffer what is just, and in the just there is absolute beauty.

From this necessary association of ill-desert with wrongdoing, springs the natural and universal passion of revenger. Under the prevalent pravity of men's hearts, this is perverted by elements of selfishness and malice into a wicked passion. But its germ is the instinctive desire that righteous vengeance be executed on the guilty perpetrator of crime. The gratification felt, when justice is thus meted out, is but a recognition by the common sense of mankind, of the universal principle that every violation of right demands reparation by the infliction of suffering. The first and simplest suggestion is that of personal satisfaction to the injured one. But poor human nature can not be trusted to let each judge in his own case, the measure of desert. Hence the idea of public satisfaction demanded by the state. But here again man's judgment is too fallible to ensure a per-

fect result. Therefore we look yet higher, to God's tribunal for a perfect judgment. There is a common belief that He, the righteous governor of all, will demand and take ultimate and complete satisfaction for all wrong by the visitation of his wrath. When he says "Vengeance is mine, I will repay," we hush the clamors of personal passion, we ask of the state only present protection, we lay over upon the government of God the responsibility of a final, full adjustment, and wait with trembling, hopeful expectation, the day when punishment, already threatened, shall be executed to express and to inflict the desert of sin with unerring justice.

The Bible representations of God as a moral governor require the view here presented. We can only string a few examples on one line of thought. God is the impersonation of moral rectitude, and so it is the everlasting song of the holy: "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." He assumes to himself the prerogative of taking vengeance for wrong, and so he is said to be "a consuming fire." The wrath of God is not a mere figure of speech. Even the Gospel proclamation of mercy has this for its background. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." "The law is holy, just and good," and the government of God is administered by that law to this end, "that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful." "The heavens and the earth which are now, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Then "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." And according to his own word: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." So "by terrible things in righteousness, wilt thou answer us, O God of our salvation, who art the confidence of the ends of the earth."

The real efficacy of parental government and of civil govern-

ment, two forms of subordinate government, designed to subserve the great end of God's moral government, depends on the recognition of this principle. Parental government has for its chief end the development of moral character. It uses what is called punishment as a necessary means for this end. But the infliction of pain here, is properly chastisement rather than punishment, designed not to render the full desert of the offence, but simply to reform the offender, yet for its proper effect, the chastening must produce some impression of ill-desert. Its power lies in this appeal to the conscience. It must teach a lesson of the legitimate supremacy of right, or it does no good. That lesson received by the child, will make the man a loyal subject of government, administered by the state and by God the supreme ruler. Again, civil government uses punishment for the protection of society, the chief end for which it exists. Yet this purpose will not be secured unless the penalties of the law are fixed and carried out with regard to justice, so as to make an impression of the sacredness of right and the ill-desert of crime. Neither of these forms of government attains a perfect result. Yet each approximates the fulfillment of its true end just in proportion as its administration is conducted with a constant recognition of the government of God as supreme ultimate avenger of all wrong.

Herein, therefore, appears the practical importance of their views on the question before us. As loose notions of the nature and object of punishment in the government of God become prevalent, the bands of civil government and family government are sure to be relaxed. Then, in turn, the failure to form good consciences under these subordinate governments, makes men skeptical and fearless and defiant, as subjects of God's government.

ARTICLE V.

INFANT BAPTISM: WHEN AND WHERE SHOULD THE
ORDINANCE BE ADMINISTERED?

SOMEWHAT extensive investigations have shown conclusively that very few of our church members have any clear and distinct views or belief in regard to the true meaning, intent, value or nature, of this ordinance, as being purely, simply and solely, the seal of the covenant made with Abraham.

On the contrary, their minds are very generally more or less confused, befogged, we might say, by a misty sort of impression, not by any means a clear belief, that the Abrahamic covenant of circumcision was, under the Mosaic ritual, somehow or other merged into, and became a part of the rite or ordinance of presentation of infant children to the Lord in his temple. And that thus at some time before the coming of Christ, circumcision had become a part of the Jewish or Mosaic ceremonial law.

Unfortunately, this state of mind does not appear to have been, or to be at the present time, by any means confined to the laity. It is evident, both from their public oral instructions and from their writings, that a very considerable proportion of the clergy have been, and still are, to a greater or less degree, in a like state of doubt and uncertainty upon this subject.

It is true that they are accustomed to teach that baptism is now the same as circumcision was, the seal of the Abrahamic covenant, to which all parents who are by faith of the seed of Abraham are entitled on behalf of their children. But then they do not stop when they have done this. They go on to expatiate upon the beauty and the propriety of this public presentation of young children to the Lord in his temple, and thus consecrating them to his service in like manner as was done by godly parents under the old dispensation. By way of enforcing this view, they have not unfrequently referred to the example of Mary in taking Jesus to the temple, "according to the law of the Lord."

The writer has been astonished to find how very large a pro

portion, not only of the laity, but also of the clergy, have supposed that Jesus was taken to the temple by his mother that he might there and then receive the ordinance of circumcision—that she might “do for him according to the law of the Lord”—instead of that she might do for herself according to the law of the Lord by presenting the required offering for her own ceremonial cleansing.

Nearly every layman, and more than three fourths of the clergymen, have been found to have been accustomed to entertain these impressions.

Of the more than two hundred and twenty pages of Dr. Wood’s lectures upon this subject, less than twenty are devoted to showing the connection of this ordinance with the Abrahamic covenant as being now its seal, as circumcision was before the coming of Christ. And this is but a fair sample of the teachings of others upon this subject.

Such universal wanderings are indicative of a corresponding unusual want of clearness in the perception of the simple truth.

For this a friend suggests a reason. He writes :

“I suppose the great obstacle to your success is the feeling that infant baptism in the presence of the congregation is a very impressive ceremony, by the right management of which great good may be done. At least it is so among us. In some communions it is valued as an opportunity for pomp and parade. Can you overcome such arguments?”

There can be no doubt as to the correctness of this suggestion. We have not unfrequently witnessed a sensitiveness and a warmth of feeling upon this point, that might well lead one to suppose that the ordinance was valued chiefly on this account.

But, unfortunately, “such arguments” can not be speedily met by addressing the reason. As Coleridge has it : “No man was ever reasoned out of a belief which he had not first been reasoned into.” If met at all, it must be by the slow working of the truth upon the mind, or by argument addressed to the emotional faculties. From attempting to do this, however, we are precluded by the nature of the subject. We are shut up, therefore, to the very difficult and comparatively slow process of reaching the feelings through the truth presented first to the

understanding. But before attempting to do this, it may not be amiss to remind the reader that no man is secure against being sadly misguided in matters of belief through the influence of his emotional nature; especially if, as in this case, his feelings accord with the whole current of popular sentiment and practice.

Another and a very effective source of this indistinctness of views is to be found in the teachings, by example, that unless there are special reasons to the contrary, the ordinance should be deferred until the child is several weeks old, until the mother is able to attend public worship, and that she should then present it to the Lord in his temple to receive it.

Its administration being thus made to conform as to time and place, if not indeed in all other respects, as nearly as the circumstances will admit, to the Jewish ceremonial presentation of young children in the temple, each instance of infant baptism becomes a most impressive although silent sermon in favor of the continuance of that part of the Mosaic ritual, instead of being one distinctly and entirely in favor of the continuance of the covenant made with Abraham, as it would be if it were administered at the time and place originally appointed for the affixing of its seal upon young children.

This mixing or coupling of these two widely diverse rites; the one Abrahamic, instituted for the purpose of bringing the child visibly into the same personal covenant relationship with God as was Abraham, and commanded to be administered on the eighth day of the child's life and at the house of the mother, and to be continued to the latest generations as the seal of an everlasting covenant never to be dissolved, the other Mosaic, of only temporary duration, instituted four hundred and thirty years afterwards for the ceremonial cleansing of the mother, to be observed in the temple of the Lord, and in no case to be observed until at least thirty three days after the other had been administered to the child; this mixing or coupling, we repeat, of these two ordinances, so diverse in all these respects, is a most surprising error.

Such teachings and such practices have not only darkened council by multitude of words, but have done much, very much, to bring very grave doubts into the minds of many of our

church members as to whether infant baptism is really a Christian ordinance at all, an ordinance of God to be observed by his people under the New Testament dispensation. The connecting of it in form, that is, the administering the one which is regarded as being still in force, not at the time and place divinely appointed for that purpose, but as nearly as possible at the time and place divinely appointed for the administration of the other, has no doubt led very many people to suppose that this ordinance is, after all, in some sense a continuance of one of the Jewish rites, all of which they believe the Scriptures plainly teach were abolished by the coming of Christ, and consequently are no longer to be in any way observed by his people.¹

This being so, and it being clearly settled in their minds that the whole Mosaic ritual, including, of course, the presentation of children to the Lord in his temple, was originally designed to be of only temporary duration and was wholly done away in Christ, it is no wonder if, as is reported, the members of our churches do gradually more and more neglect to present their children to the Lord in his house for the ordinance of baptism, or that a very large body of Christians have come to be disbelievers in the ordinance altogether.

But we believe that although the Mosaic ceremonial law was abolished by the coming of Christ, it was by no means so with the Abrahamic covenant. This was made a perpetual or an everlasting covenant, continuing in full force unto all who are or shall be by faith the children of Abraham unto the latest generations.² This covenant itself was in no wise abrogated, or even in the slightest degree changed by the coming of Christ. The covenant remaining, the seal must of necessity also remain. Otherwise the covenant would be imperfect, being destitute of a seal.

The seal, however, was changed from circumcision to baptism. There seems also to have been some change made as to the heirs of this covenant. The heirship was to be no longer so circumscribed as it had been, but become the inheritance of all those who were or should become by faith the children of Abraham. So that now every parent who is himself by faith of the seed of Abraham, may through faith and the ordinance of baptism, bring his child into the self-same covenant relation-

¹ See Epistle to the Hebrews.

² See Epistle to the Romans.

ship with God as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and their descendants brought their children by the ordinance of circumcision.

These positions are assumed as being in accordance with the settled belief of our churches. It is to some of the logical and necessary deductions therefrom, which consistency demands should be carried out in practice or the positions abandoned altogether, that we now desire to call attention.

But notwithstanding it is so evident that the above named changes were then made, there is no intimation in the Scripture nor in the history of apostolic usage, that the time for the application of the seal was at all changed, nor are we aware that it is claimed by any evangelical writer, that any such change was ever made. The change in the usage of the early Christians in regard to the time, took place during the third century, in connection with the rise and extension of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It was then gradually changed to an earlier day, evidently with the view of more certainly securing the blessings of regeneration to the child. This is evident from Cyprian's letter to Fidus, and other concurrent history. This letter was written under the following circumstances. A council of sixty bishops assembled in Carthage in the year A. D. 252; some one hundred and fifty years after the time of the Apostles. The question before the council was, not whether infants should be baptized—this was not disputed; but whether it was lawful to baptize them before they were eight days old. Fidus, a country bishop, or elder, had expressed the belief that the ancient law of circumcision should be followed in such cases.

When the council, having considered the question, had come to a result, Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, wrote to Fidus thus:

"As to the case of infants,—whereas you judge that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born, and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed; we were all of a very different opinion. Not one was of your mind; but we all rather judged that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to no human being that is born." "This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the council, that we ought not to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind to all. And this rule, as it holds for all, is, we think, more especially to be observed in reference to infants, even to those newly born."

In respect to this council and this letter, it is pertinent to remark :

1. That while such a council, held at so early a period, is certainly worthy of very high regard, we must not so far forget the severe denunciations uttered by our Saviour against the Jews for making void the law of God through the traditions of their elders, as to place implicit confidence in the correctness of its decisions. We need not to go back the half of two hundred and fifty two years to find that many at the present day differ very widely from some of the views held by their Puritan Fathers.

If the council had given us their opinion without giving their reasons for it, our reverence for the councillors should have great weight with us ; but when they give us their reasons for their opinion, we are left to judge simply of the validity of those reasons, without at all taking into consideration the personal character and standing of the councillors, or the age in which they lived.

2. The extract itself shows that the council did not, as we do, regard the ordinance as simply and solely the seal of the covenant made with Abraham ; as being essentially the same as the ordinance of circumcision. For the writer says to Fidus, who did so regard it : "We were all of a very different opinion . . . but we all rather judge that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to no human being that is born, . . . that we ought not to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God." Now if baptism and circumcision are essentially the same ordinance, it necessarily follows that if withholding baptism until the eighth day was also withholding or denying "the mercy and grace of God," the withholding of circumcision until the eighth day was also withholding or denying "the mercy and grace of God" ; and yet God "who is merciful and kind to all," did so withhold it by special command.

It is also perfectly evident, both from this letter and from concurrent history, that the council entertained a belief in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration ; a doctrine, by the way, most congenial to the unregenerate human heart, and one into which we may well suppose the early Christians were in special danger of falling ; a doctrine now held by hundreds of thousands

belonging to the Roman Catholic, the Greek, Armenian, and other unevangelical churches of Europe and Western Asia. All these nominal Christians have their children baptized as soon as possible after their birth; but we do not see the slightest evidence that by so doing they secure to their children any of the blessings God vouchsafed to Abraham, and to those of his seed who are brought into covenant relationship with him in the way of his own appointment. On the contrary, they all seem to be groping in almost utter darkness. How much this error on their part may have to do with God's hiding from them the light of his countenance, it may not be easy for us to determine; but the two so clearly connected facts should not be overlooked by us in this connection.

We, on the other hand, in common with other evangelical churches, seem to have fallen into a like serious error, but in the other direction.

The silence of history in regard to the precise time when the baptism of infants began to be deferred until after the eighth day, together with other circumstantial evidence, may safely be regarded as showing conclusively that it was not brought about by the action of any deliberate assembly, but by the action of individuals.

As the early Christians in the third century, in their zeal for securing by baptism the salvation of their children, seem to have lost sight of the Abrahamic covenant, so they of the early days of the Reformation, in their zeal to protest against the destructive error of baptismal regeneration, appear to have well-nigh lost sight of it.

And we of the present generation have most naturally continued in the same error in which we may be said to have been born. We somehow seem to have been led to imagine that we are no longer required to regard the time and place, originally appointed for the affixing of the seal of the covenant; but on the contrary, that we are left entirely to our conscience or sense of propriety, in our selection for the time for its observance. We seem to have entirely overlooked the facts, that up to the time of Christ the seal was always affixed on the eighth day; that the presentation never took place till at least thirty three days afterwards, and that even then, it was only

an incidental accompaniment, so to speak, of another and widely different ordinance; that John the Baptist and Jesus were both circumcised on the eighth day, evidently at home; that Jesus was not presented until thirty three days afterwards, and further, that there is no passage in the Bible that indicates any other day than the eighth, or any other place than the child's home for the affixing of the seal of the covenant.

In making his covenant with Abraham, God saw fit to fix upon the eighth day for the administration of the ordinance. But it does not appear from the divine record that there was any express command given in regard to the place where it should be done. Nor does it appear on careful inquiry that there was any occasion for such specification. The time when being specified, the place where could not be left in doubt. For the well known and imperative custom of those times in regard to the seclusion of women after their confinement—the inability of mothers, in the great majority of cases, safely to leave their own apartments at so early a day, and the dictate of nature that both the parents should be present to engage with the whole heart and soul in such an important and divinely appointed transaction, all clearly indicate that it was the intention of the Divine Law Giver that it should be administered at the home of the parents; and in the entire absence of the least shadow of evidence to the contrary, the narrative given by Luke respecting the circumcision of John the Baptist, clearly shows that it was so understood by those to whom the command was given. We must not here lose sight of the fact that the covenant was with Abraham and with all his seed, irrespective of sex, with the mothers as perfectly as with the fathers; as with the fathers so with the mothers. See circumcision of Timothy, his mother being a descendant of Abraham, while his father was a Greek.

But why did God fix upon the eighth day as the time when the seal of the covenant should be placed upon the young infant?

Clearly, among other reasons, we may name; first, because he had already so formed the human body and the human mind that in all ordinary cases, the mother would on that day, but not before, be so far restored from her confinement as to be

able fully to engage in the ordinance with all her moral powers and emotions, without seriously endangering her safe recovery. Before this time, the exigencies of child-birth not being fully past, there would be more or less danger in her doing so, even in the quietness and seclusion of her own home.

And we may name, secondly, that we are so constituted that at just about this time, the minds and hearts of the parents would be more fully impressed with a proper sense of the true intent, meaning and spirit of the ordinance, and would be able and likely to make a more perfect and entire consecration of the child to the Lord, than at any earlier or at any later period. In a word, he had already so constituted and ordained that the parents would at no other time or place be in so favorable a state of both body and mind to enter fully and heartily into the spirit of the occasion as just at this juncture and in their own house, where they would be free from the solicitude, embarrassments and mental agitations and distractions which would inevitably be experienced in the midst of a worshipping congregation, and which, so far as we have been able to learn, are uniformly experienced whenever it is so administered, and experienced too to such a degree as to entirely incapacitate them (particularly the mother), for any satisfactory participation in the ordinance; for then and there making a sincere and heartfelt consecration of the child to the Lord as they desire to do, and as they could do if it were administered in the quiet of her own apartments.

Now it certainly can require no argument to show that all the above named reasons, and many others not named, that existed before the coming of Christ in favor of the administration of the ordinance on the eighth day and at the home of the mother, now exist in favor of its administration at the same place and on the same day, or as soon after that as the mother is sufficiently recovered from her confinement to be able safely to enter with her whole heart and soul into the spirit of the occasion. And in the entire absence of any intimation in the Scriptures that there was ever any change of time made, or even contemplated, we are abundantly warranted in the belief that in the first establishment of the ordinance, the time for its administration was not only definitely, but unalterably fixed for all coming time.

We here see a most perfect adaptation of the time and place appointed for the service to the laws that had been already and unalterably laid deep in our very nature; a divine regard for that which some seem to look upon as a frailty worthy only of being ignored or resisted.

In our investigations of this subject, we must not allow ourselves to forget that the time when a thing is to be done is always and necessarily, from the very nature of the case, not only a very important, but even an essential part of any contract or covenant. This item, so far as we have been able to learn, has been entirely overlooked or ignored by all writers upon this subject.

God's covenant with Abraham, it is true, was not in every particular like those made by men with each other, mutually providing for and specifying the exact amount of forfeiture in case either party should fail to fulfil his part of the covenant. Far from it, for it was not to be supposed possible that there could be any such failure on God's part. Consequently his covenant with Abraham was, and with us is, more in the form of a command accompanied with the promise of a reward if by obedience we fulfil our part of the covenant, and a threat of punishment if we fail in obedience.

Neither is the precise and exact nature or amount of the reward or of the punishment specified in God's covenant with Abraham and with us. Yet it does not by any means follow, nor is there any intimation given us, that the time appointed in the covenant for the performance on our part in this regard is of any less importance in the keeping of our covenant, or for bringing ourselves, or our offspring, into covenant with God, than in regard to human covenants.

Or still further. Have we any evidence that he now regards that part of the covenant as abrogated? Or can we conceive of any way or any means by which that part of the covenant could be abrogated without necessarily involving the abrogation of the whole covenant? If so, when and by what means was it done? If we can not give affirmative and satisfactory answers to these questions, shall we venture to disregard the time when the duty is to be performed, and still expect to secure the blessings

of obedience? Shall we run such risks simply because we can not see satisfactory reasons why God should have so appointed?

The wise and judicious parent who should see fit to command his little son to perform specific acts of service at any definitely appointed time, with the promise of a reward if obedient, would soon teach that son to understand that he was not entitled to the rewards of obedience, but on the contrary exposed himself to the penalties of disobedience, if he should perform the services before the time designated, or if he delayed the performance till a later hour, unless the delay was caused by circumstances entirely beyond the child's control; and that, too, even though the child should be utterly unable to see any good reason for his father's exactness as to the time when the duty should be performed.

But notwithstanding God has so clearly revealed to us his will as to the time when and the place where he would have this ordinance administered, it by no means necessarily follows that he will not, so far as the child is concerned, accept of it when administered at some other time and place. We have reason to hope that in the plenitude of his mercy and forbearance he will do so; for he is ever ready to "pass by" our unintentional transgressions and to pardon the repenting sinner. Yet if he does so, that fact is not at all to be taken as evidence that he does not regard with displeasure the conduct of the parents in departing from the ways of his appointment. But, on the contrary, it is impossible for the human mind to conceive that he who rightfully commands, can be otherwise than displeased with those who disregard or willfully disobey, even though it may be done with the view of adding solemnity and importance to the ordinance, and of making a good impression upon others. Is not such conduct clearly indicative of arrogance, in assuming to know better than our Creator when and where it is best that it should be administered? If we may rightfully assume to change the time and place for its observance, may we not, with equal propriety, also assume the right to make any other changes in regard to it we think proper, even to the extent of omitting it altogether?

That no good can possibly be derived from administering the ordinance before the eighth day is evident from the fact that

God himself expressly commanded that it should be deferred till that day. On the other hand, if the affixing the seal is unnecessarily delayed beyond that time, it is also evident that the child is by such delay left without any claim or title to the blessings of the covenant, and must remain so until such time as the parents shall have had the ordinance administered to God's acceptance, or he shall, by his own faith and obedience, become an heir to the promises.

The parents certainly can not claim for the child the covenanted blessings after the child is eight days old, until the seal of the covenant has been acceptably affixed. We have too many times witnessed the anxiety of parents to have their dangerously sick children baptised, not to be convinced that the Christian heart, when brought to the test, uniformly and instinctively beats responsively to the truth of this position. Moreover, the failure of the parents to have the seal affixed on the eighth day, unless such failure is unavoidable, must be regarded as a violation of the covenant on their part, and consequently and necessarily, speaking after the manner of men, as an absolving of God from all obligations to keep it on his part. If he renews it, it will be of his own abounding mercy and grace.

These are contingences which it must be anything but agreeable for loving Christian parents to contemplate; particularly if the error is regarded in its true light, as somehow causing multitudes of other Christian parents to neglect the ordinance altogether, and thus indirectly depriving great multitudes of children of whatever of blessing God has covenanted with Abraham and his seed to bestow upon all their infant children upon whom they shall cause the seal to be applied.

We now unhesitatingly submit that we ought to have the ordinance administered at the home of the mother, when the child is one week old. Or, if the health of the mother, or any other cause, absolutely prevents its being administered on that day, it should be administered as soon after that time as possible. And we also as unhesitatingly submit that, in case we reject this conclusion, consistency absolutely demands of us to wholly abandon the view that infant baptism is now, as circumcision was, the seal of the covenant made with Abraham.

To this, it has been objected, that infant baptism being an or

dinance of the church, it should be administered in the house of God, and during some meeting of the church for public worship. This objection has been so often made that we must not fail to notice it; and yet we confess ourselves unable to see either its pertinence or its force. For, upon careful inspection, it appears that even admitting that it may in some sense be regarded as an ordinance of the church, it by no means necessarily follows that the covenant is not a personal one between God and the individual, or that its seal should be publicly affixed. In either case, the divine appointments in regard to its administration remain precisely the same. Whether it should or should not be regarded as an ordinance of the church, must evidently depend entirely upon the sense in which the term church is used. It is but too evident that our ideas become confused by indefiniteness in its use. It is clearly an ordinance of the church in precisely the same sense as was the ordinance of circumcision, and in no other. If we use the word church in its most unrestricted sense, as having, under the old dispensation, included and been composed of all those who had been brought by the ordinance of circumcision into visible covenant relationship with God, notwithstanding they were never associated together into an organized community, then circumcision was evidently an ordinance of this same unorganized church.

But if by the term church, under the old dispensation, we mean the organized Jewish nation, then it as evidently was not, exclusively, at least, an ordinance of the church; for although circumcision was a prerequisite for admission into it, yet there were multitudes of the duly circumcised descendants of Abraham who were not, in any sense whatever, members of the organized Hebrew commonwealth.

So, under the new dispensation, if by the term church we mean the unorganized aggregate of all who have been duly baptized, then it is evidently an ordinance of the church in precisely the same sense as circumcision was of the unorganized [Abrahamic?] church.

But if we use the term church in a more common and restricted sense, as embracing only those who have by covenant become members of, and responsible to, some organized body of true believers, then, by the very terms of definition, it is not

baptism, but it is the entering into covenant that initiates one into the church.

In this respect the usages of our churches correspond very closely to the usage of the Hebrew church; for, while we do not admit any to our churches who have not been duly baptized, there are multitudes whom we regard as having been, by baptism, brought visibly into personal covenant relationship with God, whom we do not regard as being, in any sense whatever, members of, or responsible to, God's organized church or any of its branches.

The much discussed, if not much vexed, question of the ecclesiastical status of baptized children, then, is one very easily determined by the very simple process of precisely defining the sense in which we use the term church. That they are, by baptism, brought visibly into the same personal covenant relationship to God as were Abraham and his descendants is perfectly evident, while at the same time it is as perfectly evident that they are not thereby brought into covenant relationship with, or made, in any sense, responsible to, any organized body of believers.

Let us then have a return to the practice of affixing the seal of the covenant to our infant children at the time and place God has so clearly revealed to be his will. The whole covenant and its seal may be perhaps somewhat of a mystery to us. It may be doubtful whether we fully understand its whole bearing, and is it not quite possible that God may place more importance upon the time and place than we have been accustomed to suppose?

ARTICLE VI.

THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY.

PRUDENT men are accustomed, at the opening of a new year, to look into the state of their affairs and forecast their prospects for the future. It is not less interesting, and perhaps not altogether without profit, to take a view of the condition of the country and see whither it is drifting; for drifting rather than guidance expresses its movement, except as it is under the keeping of a wise and beneficent Providence.

Our design, at the present time, requires us to consider the state of the country in its national, financial and political aspects. An abundant yield of the fruits of the earth and a fair reward of industrial toil, favorably affect the finances of a country and thus direct its politics. On the other hand, political mismanagement often deranges the finances and so checks the industry of a people, thus nullifying, in a measure, the joint products of a generous soil and a propitious sky. At one time, a failing crop is the occasion of a riot or a revolution; at another, an unwise or a wicked government destroys and plunders the fruits of industry, and defeats the generosity of nature.

The material condition of the country is, on the whole, favorable; and this is a point of great consequence at the present crisis, when our political relations are so much disturbed. The crops of all kinds have been of more than average abundance. All the great staples of life have been produced in liberal measures by the teeming earth. Grains of all kinds fill our granaries, or are on their way to feed the hungry of less favored lands. Cattle, sheep and swine in countless thousands have been fattened by our grass and grains and roots. Of food there is enough and to spare.

Turning from our fields and looking to the seats of mechanical industry, we find that many kinds of business have been carried on with profit. The aggregate of incomes is large, while the scale of expenditures by all classes engaged in these

pursuits proves that wages are advanced. There are exceptions, partly because, in some localities, business has been overdone, a result which always and almost inevitably follows a season of prosperity.

It is doubtless true that some branches of manufacturing industry have been, and are now, depressed. The enormous profits of recent years are not realized. Great establishments are running at a loss. But two things may be said in regard to this state of the manufacturing interest. First, the great incomes of four or five years of unprecedented success enable the rich owners of cotton, woollen and iron mills to tide over the present time of depression; and secondly, a part of the present depression is owing to the over production of former years. If more fabrics are made than the people need and can purchase, the surplus must be piled up or sold at a sacrifice. In the meantime the wheels keep turning, and the presumption is strong that it is more profitable for the owners to have them move than hang idly on their pivots. Making suitable allowance, therefore, the whole view is favorable. In all our great material interests on the land, and on the sea as well, we have been blessed by a benignant Providence. At the North and the South, in the West and the East, busy brains and busy hands have wrought out an immense product, far beyond the wants of the year, enabling us to pay for the past and to provide for the future.

In ordinary times an abundance of the comforts and even luxuries of life would indicate a sound financial condition. But our case is exceptional. The national debt, amounting in round numbers to \$2,500,000,000, with town, city, and state debts, incurred in suppressing the rebellion, bears with immense weight upon production and depletes the income of all those who depend upon salaries or dividends. A large portion of this debt is due to foreign creditors who are continually drawing the precious metals out of the country, in the payment of interest. We are so much the poorer by all that was consumed in the war, over and above what would have been consumed if peace had not been interrupted. To this must be added the loss of the labor of a million of men during four years. The real pecuniary loss to the North, growing directly out of the rebell-

ion, can not be less than \$4,000,000,000; while that of the South is at least half that amount. In other words, the whole nation has sunk not less than \$6,000,000,000 in civil war. In this computation no allowance is made for the loss of property in slaves, since emancipation is no loss to the country. It merely effects a change of ownership; and the result will be a great pecuniary gain, inasmuch as now, when they own themselves, they will raise more and save more than when compelled to labor for others.

An evil additional to the debt, and in a measure growing out of it, is a deranged currency. The currency can never be in a healthy condition when gold is at a premium. For many months the gold dollar has averaged about a dollar and forty cents in paper. The aggregate of injustice and wrong growing out of this fact is beyond estimate. While some are enriched vast numbers are defrauded. The price of things in daily use is greatly increased, but the wages of labor have not increased in the same ratio. Thus it has become more difficult for the laborer to keep the wolf of hunger from the door. Dealers in money and credits have piled up great fortunes, while people of moderate means have been driven to ceaseless and poorly rewarded toil.

The evil is aggravated by the uncertainty in regard to the future which is a characteristic of the times. We have no settled financial policy. Neither political party has fixed upon a course which it is pledged to pursue, and neither has the courage or the wisdom to arrange a platform for the future. Both are waiting for something to turn up. Congress has provided for the support of the government, the payment of the interest of the national debt, and of a portion of the debt itself. This is well. No other course could be taken without national bankruptcy and disgrace. And in doing this Congress has only registered the will of the people, who have, since the firing of the first gun at the opening of the rebellion, been in advance of their representatives in the legislative and executive departments at Washington. The country is waiting for a financial policy, but it waits in vain. We have able men in great numbers, but no man seems qualified to take the lead and inaugurate a system by which the currency shall be placed upon a sound basis.

Besides, the fear of a great financial revulsion, which has haunted prudent men for several years, has secretly become intensified, and there is a strong indisposition to lay plans for business in the immediate future. Investments in real estate, except in the centres of growing towns and cities, are considered risky. The fear of change rests like a nightmare on the heart of business. Moreover, there has, of late, been a partial return to the former system of long credits, and thousands of men who had begun to do business on the cash system have become involved in debt. Revulsion is drawing nearer and yet its approach is not wisely provided for by keeping free from debt.

If we add that a tariff, which in many particulars is simply abominable, has been fastened upon the country by log-rolling legislation, we only add to the truthfulness of the picture. At the opening of Congress in December 1866, Mr. Wells, who had made the tariff a profound study, prepared a very able report on the finances and a bill for revising the tariff and the whole financial policy of the country. Instead of accepting his recommendations, a plan was adopted made up of "shreds and patches," as if for the express purpose of fostering certain branches of business at the expense of the country.

In addition to all these evils, enormous frauds on the revenue, both by smuggling and by violations of the internal revenue system, have become common. One class of law-breakers have had the unblushing impudence to propose to the government to pay a certain sum—far less than the tax levied upon them—for the privilege of making and selling whiskey. All these violations and evasions of the revenue laws are not only dishonest actions as regards the government, but they are a species of robbery as regards the rest of the community. The man who fails to bear his part of the public burdens compels his neighbors to make up the deficiency; and he is morally just as great a rogue as if he picked his neighbors' pockets to the same amount. Here is an array of causes which are rapidly gendering uneasiness and distrust. Society is heaving like the swell of the ocean sometimes observed in the commencement of a storm.

But there is another fact, not yet adverted to, which is of ominous significance. Shall the faith of the government be

kept with the public creditors? Passing over the question in regard to the obligation to pay all the national bonds in gold, both principle and interest, there is a growing number who join in the clamor against exempting national stocks from taxation. The solemn pledge of the government is on record, binding it not to take from the public creditors a portion of the interest due to them, by taxing the national stocks in their possession. The very agitation of the subject awakens distrust and loosens the bands of society.

In view of all this array of evils the question may arise, why then has not the country been ruined? What can prevent universal stagnation of business and general bankruptcy? In reply, it may safely be said that our exemption is not due to legislation. The wisdom of political leaders has wrought next to nothing for the public safety, so far as the financial condition of the country is concerned. Two causes have operated in our favor. In the first place, the country was much richer at the outbreak of the rebellion than was generally supposed. The United States was, perhaps, after Great Britain, the wealthiest country in the Christian world. An industrious, frugal and rapidly increasing population had been accumulating property for nearly three generations. Two or three brief wars had scarcely checked the increase of wealth. Our resources were very great and thus we were enabled to pour out money like water in the defence of the national life.

Secondly, since the attack was made on Fort Sumter, the population of the country has increased, by birth and immigration, not less than five millions of souls. By this means at least a million of laborers have been added to the annual productive force of the country. They have earned two hundred millions of dollars, in round numbers, above what has been consumed for their subsistence. By the increase and improvement of machinery work has been done equivalent to the labor of half a million hands. Hence we have a production of not less than three hundred million dollars annually above the annual production previous to the war. And this increase of productive power, with the bounty of Providence in abundant harvests, has enabled us to bear the heavy burden imposed by the rebellion. The industry of the people and the favor of

God, rather than the wisdom of public men, have procured our safety.

A country, blessed like ours with all the riches of the soil, the mines and the sea, and heaping up wealth in spite of the waste of war, ought to enjoy a political millennium. If there was harmony of sentiment in relation to great points of public policy, all our financial difficulties could be easily settled. But the war has left heart-burning, hatred and strife. The conquered party have submitted sullenly to the heavy arm of power. The prospect of negro equality has exasperated their feelings of shame and hate. If not ready to join a foreign enemy in humiliating their country, they are eager to unite with any body of men in defeating the party which compelled them to lay down their arms. Knowing that unless the course of events in this country can be turned back, that unless the government can be seized by them aided by Northern allies, they must go into history not only as the champions of a lost cause but as the champions of an infamous cause, the Southern leaders are watching their opportunity for power, for revenge, and for an honorable page in the annals of the world.

The Democratic party has been for several years in a bad position. It has not joined in the rebellion; it has not heartily engaged in suppressing it. Thousands of its best men have left it forever. The residue supported the government while cherishing a feeling of tenderness towards the rebels. They are now disposed to affiliate with them on almost any terms if, by their help, they may get control of the national government. Flushed by recent successes in the autumn elections the Democratic party is hoping to regain power, office and patronage. But it has no settled and avowed policy. What it would do with the Freedmen; what with the National Banks; what about specie payments; and what in relation to the public debt, is unknown. All is left to chance—to the turn of the tide, while the struggle for power goes on. The negro can not be reënslaved, but perhaps he may be kept under; the national debt must not be really repudiated, but possibly the creditors of the government may be frightened into exchanging their bonds for others bearing a smaller rate of interest, or into submission to taxation of the stocks they hold; the finances

may be tampered with until the people are ready for any change, while the only settled purpose of the party is to get the helm of state into their hands. By this it is not meant that the Democratic party is willing to see the country ruined, or is destitute of patriotism; but simply that its first, second and third purpose is to put down the Republicans, and gain the control of the national government. The Northern section of the party is eager to join their ancient *confreres* of the South on any terms that will ensure success, trusting to the course of events or to Providence, according to individual characteristics, to save the country from disaster.

In the meantime, the Republican party does not meet the demands of the crisis in our national affairs. It has no financial policy. Different gentlemen of great ability have put forth their views, and they each have a respectable following; but the party has not adopted any system to meet the financial evils that beset us. Some are for, and some are against the national banking system. Some are in favor of paying the national debt speedily; some for throwing the main part of it upon posterity; while others are advocates for a moderate rate of payment, which will distribute the debt over a long course of years. All the leading men are in favor of negro suffrage in the reconstructed States, and perhaps, also, in the loyal States; but they differ in regard to the mode of reaching that result. And so in relation to every question of importance, there is no well-defined and avowed policy. The party has no acknowledged leader. All things are, and will be, at loose ends, until a national convention shall set up its platform, and place a standard-bearer upon it. An effort has been honestly made to establish impartial suffrage in some of the Northern States, but has failed through the force of remaining prejudice. The party is now helpless at the feet of General Grant. He can receive the nomination for the presidency, without conditions or pledges, if he so elects. Their silent, tobacco-smoking General has the game in his own hands, and their main dependence is upon his sterling honesty.

The Republican party has been kept in power during the last seven years because the course of events compelled it to take high moral ground. In putting down the rebellion, the dis-

carded, but still sacred and living truths of the Declaration of Independence, were again made the watchwords of party. The spirit of the old Puritans was roused to meet the old Cavaliers in their descendants. The party was under the necessity of going back to first principles; and, by so doing, it gained the support of the great mass of religious, moral and temperance people. And this great class never feared or faltered for one moment, not even in the most gloomy hours of the war. They had faith in the cause; they had confidence in Mr. Lincoln, and they trusted in the God of their fathers. By their support the government was invincible and victorious. The rebellion was subdued; slavery was abolished; the national credit was sustained, and the national honor was preserved inviolate in the eyes of foreign powers.

But we are now in a new state of things. Slavery is abolished, and the question of abolition is eliminated from politics. There is a conviction that the Freedmen will, in some way, come into the secure possession of all their rights, in the course of time, and as a logical sequence of the war. There was no other political question that specially interested religious and moral men, as such, except that relating to the license, or the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors. And though this was a matter of State, rather than national legislation, yet it had its influence in binding good men to the party.

The great mass of temperance voters, so called, were in alliance with the Republican party. But there is no longer any reason why they should retain that connection, so far as legislation on the temperance question is concerned. In Massachusetts the support of temperance men has been forfeited by the Republican party. Led by a majority of its prominent men, and nearly all the daily press, a large section has united with the Democrats and smitten the friends of prohibition in the face with a rum bottle. They are exulting over their victory. But it portends the breaking up of the party. In New York the same result substantially has come to pass with the additional shame of yielding to the German clamor for a gay, dissipating European Sunday in the place of our long-established, all-conserving Christian Sabbath.

In other States the party has not the moral courage to enact and enforce a prohibitory, or even a stringent license law. In

other words, it has no claims to the support of religious, moral and temperance men, except for purely political reasons. The necessity of maintaining a high moral stand having passed away with the rebellion and with slavery, a set of men have come to the front in the Republican lines which spurns moral restraints by way of political action. Nothing is left but questions of political importance. The party has run a great career, but it is now apparently sinking to the level of those parties which have ceased to be, because they had no vital principle. Questions relating to the tariff, the banks, the debt the Indians, and to our relations with foreign nations, will occupy the public mind, and on these questions the country will form itself into new parties. This is the logical sequel of events. By nominating Gen. Grant, on his own terms, the Republicans could probably be successful in the presidential contest, but the victory would secure no desirable results. Abandoning its high position as a party of moral principles, for the sake of success, it would obtain power, and then die; for the great body of people who are governed by religious principle will be compelled to form a new political combination, to save themselves from being driven to the wall, and to maintain the dearest interests of society.

Such is the tendency of things at present; but there is yet a chance for the Republican party to perpetuate its power. By sternly determining to support no man who will not pledge himself to follow out the course of policy, in relation to the colored people, to its logical result, in their complete enfranchisement, and inaugurating a system of instruction that will qualify them for the duties of citizenship; and at the same time, by State legislation, resisting the efforts of those who are bent on removing all restriction on the sale and use of ardent spirits and on desecrating our American Sabbath, would they retain the support of that growing class who carry conscience into politics. By taking this course they would force Gen. Grant up to the proper standard of action; and with him they could carry the country.

But suppose he is too confident in his position to give any pledge to the party, there is still a bright future possible to it. Let it plant itself firm and immoveable on the platform of prin-

ciple, and nominate some able man in acknowledged sympathy with the platform. It would then have the support of all the reconstructed States, since the emancipated voters and all of their color in the South and the North, would confide in him almost as much as they did in Mr. Lincoln. He could carry enough Northern States, if a bold and gallant canvass were made, to secure his election. But suppose failure should be the result in the next election, still there would be a great, complete, national party, instinct with the principles of freedom, and bound together by the cohesion of moral forces, which would hold the administration in check, and be certain, at the succeeding election, to take permanent possession of the government. Whether it can rise to the greatness of the crisis, or grasping for immediate success, it shall abandon moral principle and become a mere political party, it is now called upon, in the providence of God, to decide. Meantime, let none despair of the Republic. Though the forces of evil in our country are more powerful than ever before, thank God, the relative numbers and influence of the good have never been so great as at present since the inauguration of Washington. We need only to abide by our principles and trust in God.

ARTICLE VII.

SHORT SERMONS.

"She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her; and happy is every one that retaineth her."—*Prov.* iii. 18.

A CHANGE of circumstances may revolutionize a man's habits and tastes. It was so with the first man. Though he chafed under his altered condition, to his race it soon became second nature and agreeable. It was, however, destructive. And God provided a remedy by which the natural results of the change to the individual may be reversed. As a tree of life, Religion is a foretaste of heaven.

1. The religion of Christ placates the angel of the flaming sword. The cherubic guard represented the divine justice; God alone, there-

ore, could give the sinner the watchword by which he may pass the sentinel. That is none other than the name of Jesus Christ.

2. It reinstates the exile. The atonement is not merely negative in its efficacy. The penitent, believing sinner shall not only be reprieved, but restored to paradise and the tree of life.

3. It affords a refuge to the exposed and tempted. There is a possibility of relapse. The same forbidden tree remains. The adversary lurks in the shade of it. Christ's grace is sufficient for the tempted, turning weakness into strength.

4. It is a germ of blessed immortality. Sin did not destroy natural immortality, but rendered it miserable; grace renders it blessed, and makes the body itself partaker of it. Of nothing but the religion of Christ can it be said, "She is a tree of life."

5. It is the only recuperative power from spiritual maladies. The banishment implied that there was healing virtue in the tree of life. The religion of Christ is the substitute, but superior in efficacy. The process may be long, but it is sure.

6. It is the rejuvenator of age. Age as such is the effect of sin. Grace works results which offset disease and deterioration, and will ultimately make a thousand years as one day, and one day as a thousand years.

7. It is the perfect antidote of death as the penalty of transgression. It furnishes expiation, regeneration, sanctification, rejuvenation and eternal life.

What more would any man have religion comprise? Nothing else can offer more. Nothing else can offer so much. Take the watchword, pass the sentinel, take of the tree of life, and eat and live forever.

"Feed the flock of God."—1 Peter v. 2.

THE Eastern Shepherd with his flock, affords the favorite inspired analogue of the pastoral office. In the text it presents the primary object and value of the office with much force and aptness. The great need of the flock of God is *feeding*; and that is the bishop's first work, to *feed the flock of God*. There is danger, particularly in an impatient, hurrying age, that the plans and aims of pastors will be made for direct and immediate effect upon the unregenerate rather than upon the flock of God. It requires cooler judgment, broader vision, deeper philosophy and experience to adhere to what seems to be the divine plan; that of making the church so pure, strong, firm, exemplary and zealous as to be chiefly the direct in-

strument and medium for effect upon the unbelieving world. The great reliance for making the church all this is spiritual feeding; and God has provided ample food in his word. The bishop has not to create or invent it; God has stored it ready to the minister's hands, a rich treasury of all that he needs, and for all the varying wants of every flock in every age. He must select and adapt it to the different necessities and circumstances of his flock. Like a wise and tender shepherd, he must dress and prepare the food with much diligence, so as best to stimulate a wholesome appetite and render it most digestible and nourishing. The great staples of life must never be wanting, though they may be enriched by variety and set off with delicacies and flowers. The table must, however, always be spread with real food. Reproof may sometimes be needed, entertainment may attract, but the great business of the shepherd is to feed the flock of God. And this is in accordance with the example of apostles and prophets whose instructions were so largely addressed to the flock. It is in accordance with the requirements which the Saviour enforces upon the flock, that they should be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. When they are such, sinners will be converted.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY NOTICES.

- 1.—*Meditations on the Actual State of Christianity, and on the attacks which are now being made upon it.* By M. GUIZOT. Translated under the superintendence of the author. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway.

THE title indicates the scope of the work. The theme is handled with reference to France in the present century. Starting with a notice of Napoleon's Concordat and Chateaubriand's "*Génie du Christianisme*" as the immediate occasion of the awakening of Christianity, the author proceeds in a brief and rapid manner to mark the improvements in the Roman Catholic Church; bringing forward in chronological order the men and their works, that have been the chief agents, and giving an appreciative estimate of characteristics and results. Turning to the Protestant Church, he inter-

rogates the chiefs and shows how they have met and failed to meet the responsibilities which the exigencies of the times imposed; sketching with admiration the labors of Eucontre, Uinet, and Adolphe Monod, and recognizing the superior genius of Protestant Christianity in the passion for saving souls.

Next the author traces the philosophical movements over the same period. Of the various schools the Spiritualistic has been the most prolific of eminent and distinguished men and works, and "remains in possession of the domain and of the banner of Philosophy." It has pursued the scientific method, insisted on the radical distinction between good and evil as the basis of morals, and laid in human freedom and responsibility the foundation of civil liberty. Yet instead of carrying psychology to the summit and joining it with the lights from above, this school has offered natural religion and religious philosophy to meet the spiritual cravings of humanity, and, by circumscribing its proper field of inquiry, given rise to Rationalism. Guizot evidently appreciates the errors of the rationalistic school, and presents its champions as self-stultified in their "involuntary, invincible anxiety when confronting the chasms of their system, and dealings with the incoherencies of their convictions." Positivism is a misnomer, ambitious, arrogant, incoherent and insane; which neither Littré of Paris nor Mill of London can save and immortalize. Pantheism deifies the universe, ignorant or neglectful of the scientific method, and knowing no higher law than, in the judgment of Willm. "Man's will be done." Materialism is but another name for sensualism, and even for one school of Pantheism; for it materializes God. Though making evident progress, it is yet timid, as is readily shown by the discourse of its advocates. To Skepticism, which Jouffroy thinks the idol "of little minds," Guizot accords the merit of exposing the incompleteness of human knowledge and the frequency of error, and of furnishing some salutary admonitions against an overweening confidence in one's own ideas and against intolerance of the ideas of others.

These philosophical systems have contributed more or less to that impiety and recklessness and perplexity which pervade, like a pestilential miasma, the intellectual and moral atmosphere of society. The influence of the first has been favorable in part, but that of all the rest antagonistic to Christianity, which, in spite of them, has made undeniable and encouraging progress in the hearts of many and in society. Let those who are enamoured with these infidel systems, falsely called sciences, be admonished by this testimony of a Voltairean: "I felicitate myself that my wife is a Christian, and I

mean my daughters to be brought up like Christian women. These demolishers know not what they are doing; it is not merely upon our churches, it is upon our houses, our houses and their inmates, that their blows are telling!"

The volume is instructive and refreshing for the field and the period it covers, and prepares the way for another in which Christianity will account for its success, while its antagonists fail, because of its supernatural source, and its adaptation to the spiritual wants and welfare of mankind.

2.—*Devotional Guides*. By Rev. ROBERT PHILIP, of Maberly Chapel. With an Introductory Essay, by Rev. Albert Barnes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1868.

It is now more than thirty years since Mr. Barnes wrote the essay commending this book. Already the "Guides" had been published in separate treatises and extensively circulated in England. The work is arranged in two volumes, with three treatises each. The titles are, "Christian Experience; or, a Guide to the Perplexed": "Communion with God; or, a Guide to the Devotional": "Eternity Realized: or, a Guide to the Thoughtful": "The God of Glory; or, a Guide to the Doubting": "Pleasing God; or, a Guide to the Conscientious": "Redemption; or, the New Song in Heaven." The whole makes a compact duodecimo of nearly eight hundred pages. Perhaps it will be more useful in this form than in any other. Yet the work is worthy to be issued in six volumes, in the highest style of the Riverside Press.

The author's style suits his object, being clear and direct. And his wide range of themes shows that he was no common or superficial thinker upon the Christian life. He had rare power in analyzing religious experience, and in applying the word of God to the varied wants of different persons, and of the same person in different phases and stages. His work has the rare merit of being equally well adapted to all Christians and in successive generations; for it deals with their common experiences, and with the truths appropriate to relieve them in perplexities, guide and encourage them in their warfare, console them in their despondencies, refresh and strengthen them in their self-examinations and spiritual meditations.

We would therefore commend it to all pastors, to all persons who have occasion to counsel their fellow Christians or even inquirers after the truth as it is in Jesus, to teachers in Sabbath-schools, and in short, to every Christian who feels that he has not yet outgrown the necessity of other "Guides" than the Scriptures, as a book

which will be likely to afford, under one or more of its themes, instructions adapted to almost every emergency in Christian experience and life. It may be read repeatedly and with interest, and will be found to be one of those few uninspired works which find their natural place in proximity to the Bible.

- 3.—*History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America.* By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. Vols. III. and IV. pp. 510, 522. New York: Carleton & Porter.

THESE two volumes close the history, so far as Dr. Stevens is concerned, bringing the marvelous story down to 1820. The work is well done and is a credit to Methodism and to Christianity. It is worth much to have such Christian enterprise and success, such fervid piety and apostolic labors as those of Francis Asbury, Jacob Young, Wm. McKendree, Richard Whatcoat, Peter Cartwright and hundreds of others, put on record by such a fervid and glowing writer, who has been called, by the leading men of his church, the Ecclesiastical Macaulay. The author has the great excellence of being always on fire with the glory of his theme. He says: "It may be doubted whether it has ever devolved upon an ecclesiastical historian to record a more curious, a more marvelous story than I have attempted in these volumes; more replete with heroic characters, romantic incidents, extraordinary labors and successes." And upon reading these volumes one hesitates no longer in accepting the saying of the *London Quarterly Review*, that "American Methodism is the most wonderful instance of church development which the world's history has yet shown." That the leaders of this now great, popular and wealthy body have reason for anxiety over the recent controversies and divisions of the Methodists in this country we hear occasionally confessed. May their prosperity not be their evil star. May they grow more and more educated and Calvinistic, and their numbers and influence for Christ go on multiplying until the time of the restitution of all things.

The first and second volumes recorded the planting and development of the system, defining its theological and ecclesiastical principles. These two carry forward the history, chiefly through the biography of its leading men, grouping them into sections of the country, East, West, South and Middle, and closing with chapters on General Conferences; Auxiliary Plans and Institutions; Literary, Educational, Missionary, etc.; Actual and Prospective results; and last of all, the Deaths of several of the great lights of this church.

The heroic endurance and zeal displayed by the itinerants who

confronted the perils and hardships of frontier work at the South and West, and in Canada, are soul-stirring, and the accounts of them may well supply the place of novels and romances for some years throughout the Methodist Church. Such graphic pictures as that which describes the taking possession of the Natchez district are of frequent occurrence. At a house in Chillicothe, Ohio, where a number of itinerants were staying while attending the Western Conference in 1807, Bishop Asbury took Jacob Young into a room apart and solemnly read to him Jacob's journey from his father's house to Padan-aram. Then rising, the bishop laid his hands on the head of the startled young man and commissioned him to go down the Mississippi and take charge of the Natchez district. "Go," he said, "in the name of the Lord, do your duty, and God will be with you"; and then turning left him alone. At the close of the conference he was conducted to a pious house where instructions were given him; a solemn prayer was offered amid shouting and tears, and he turned his face cheerfully away from civilization into the wilderness to find the savages both white and dark. He says: "My fine Arabian horse being brought to the gate, I took my saddlebags on my arm, and gave my friends the parting hand. Martha followed to the gate and gave me a vest pattern and a silver dollar. I mounted and rode away, travelling nearly two hundred miles alone. The vows of the Almighty were upon me. My field of labor was large, in a strange country, far from home." In due time he came to the place of rendezvous where a few appointed preachers met him. Two or three days were spent in making plans and preparations for passing the dangerous, robber-infested road from Nashville to Natchez. At sundown each day they halted, tied their horses to the trees, took out their camp-kettle and cooked their supper, each one carrying his knife and making a fork and whatever else he needed of wood. Wherever they found a few souls, there they prayed and talked and preached Christ. Their camp-meetings were noised abroad, and Chickasaws, Choctaws and godless, reckless, hardy frontier settlers gathered to hear and be moved by the rough, burning eloquence of the men who attested their sincerity by their cheerful endurance of the hardships of a wild life, swimming rivers, losing themselves in woods and swamps, making their way by Indian trails, that they might convince these lost men of the certainty of eternal death, and lead them through the open door of the Way of Life.

- 4.—*The History of the Church of God, during the period of Revelation.* By REV. CHAS. COLCOCK JONES, D. D. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. Boston: Graves & Young. Part 1. pp. 558. 1867.

THIS first volume covers the Old Testament history, and is a kind of running commentary of it, by a scholarly and able Presbyterian who writes very much in the style and phraseology of the Presbyterian systems of divinity of a generation past. Indeed the author wrote it in his declining years, embodying the substance of his lectures while Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the Theological Seminary of the Synods of South Carolina and Georgia, in Columbia. It is positive and unequivocal in elevating the Scriptures to supreme authority, and was intended rather as "a Church History for the families of the Lord's people." The author assumes that, all through the first two thousand years down to the calling of Abraham, the church existed and acted in an organized distinct form, although that particular form is not preserved in the record. He thinks no new church was founded in Abraham, but Abraham was "drawn out of the ancient church," and a change made in the organization of the church for one distinct people, the Jews. In this view it would be an interesting inquiry, what became of the old organization out of which Abraham was "drawn"? Slavery is stoutly maintained as "sanctioned in both the Old and the New Testament," and slavery, too, both "temporary and perpetual," the full "ownership of the slave," both by the master and the civil power, "for the control of his person," and "in order to secure his service." Having penned this last sentence it is no use to write more, for nobody now would read farther, or care to know more about this antiquity.

- 5.—*Prayers from Plymouth Pulpit.* By HENRY WARD BEECHER. Phonographically Recorded. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1867.

THESE prayers are very simple, fervent and appropriate utterances, and at once illustrate the infelicity of prayer-books and the felicity of our Puritan habits of worship. They may be profitably studied by ministers and laymen who would attain larger liberty and facility of expression in their devotions. There is such a thing as a dead prayer, even though it be clothed in the language of inspiration. The Bible models of prayer are no more to be adopted as a whole, and made the only vehicle of our petitions, than the prayers of prayer-books. And we have heard ministers complained of as common-

place in prayer, mainly because they always fell into the habit of dead repetition from the Bible. The forms of the Bible should be vitalized by a man's own fervid personality, and then when employed, they are apt and edifying.

6.—*The Old Roman World.* The Grandeur and Failure of its Civilization. By JOHN LORD, LL. D. pp. 605. New York: Scribner & Co. 1867.

THE story of the growth and decay of the old Roman power is full of dramatic and most tragic interest. If "romance is always sorrow," then is it most sorrowful. Dr. Lord has grasped it in its poetic as well as matter of fact aspects, has put his imagination as well as his scholarship into the work of depicting the grandeur and failure of this mighty dominion; and the result is a very noble piece of historic criticism. It is this, and not a detailed history. Hence it is to be compared rather with DeQuincy's bazar than with the voluminous works of Gibbon and Merrivale. It is not like DeQuincy's unique treatise, as nothing could be, in its close, sharp, trenchant dissection of the dying and dead empire of Rome, in its unimpassioned but strangely stirring eloquence, nor in its eccentricities of mental vision. But it sweeps a broader plane of discussion, is greatly fuller of information, and in every way a far more complete survey and discourse of the subject undertaken, as its title might imply.

The special topics handled in these ample pages are, the military organization and conquests of Rome; her material greatness and wonders; her art, literature, philosophy, and scientific knowledge, as well as those of Greece, her teacher in all these things; the Roman constitution, jurisprudence, and social condition; the merging of the republic into the empire, and the fall of this through internal corruption, and outside barbaric inroads; the reasons why this catastrophe was not prevented by the conservative forces of the old paganism, or of the new Christianity; and the benefactions of the early church to all later generations. This concluding section, which is one of the most valuable in the book, has already instructed and delighted our readers, as an article in the last volume of this *Review*.

It will be seen that the author has proposed to himself a task requiring a high order of literary power for its adequate accomplishment. It could be safely attempted by no one who had not given many years to the theory of the details of the long story; who had not an unusual gift of condensing and grouping a vast multitude of

facts ; who had not a philosophical mind, a just and delicate critical sense ; and, not least, a reverently Christian temper. If Dr. Lord had not brought to his work a fair amount of these qualifications, his labor would have been a failure. We think that he is deficient in none of these furnishings, while in some of them he is eminent. He masses the elements of the early Roman grandeur, so much nobler than the more dazzling splendors of the subsequent imperial rule, with almost bewildering effect. His analysis of the constitution, the military and juridical economy of that people, is careful and intelligible. His painting of the bacchanalian sensualism of the empire is appalling, yet not indelicate. But we read with still deeper interest his closing chapters upon the inevitable self-destruction of that fearfully wicked and totally rotten civilization, which neither the ethics taught by Aurelius, or the Christianity preached by St. Paul could hinder. We have read these chapters, shall we say, with a thrilling sense of their timeliness, as a warning to the increasing profligacy of our own material, sensual, skeptical age and land. In this light, they deserve, we would like to say, they demand, the serious perusal of the leaders of popular thought among ourselves, and that immediately. For although we are at an immense remove as yet from the degeneracy of that empire, we are nursing in our national life the very cancer which ate out the vitality of that once mighty and invincible people. The Christianity, which in its infancy did not leave Rome, must in its manhood, save us from that old world putridity and death. We believe it will ; but by earnest work, not through lazy, shirking "observation."

Dr. Lord's review of the heathen philosophers shows conscientious and abundant reading, and well-balanced thought. His criticism of ancient art and literature is sufficient, perhaps, for his purpose ; it could be little more than the reproduction of former opinions on this very hackneyed theme. We should have better liked, not a lengthier but a more discriminating, a less eulogistic treatment of this subject. And upon the toning of the whole book, particularly of its earlier chapters, we have the general criticism to make, that it is too intense. The style has too much of the lecturer's gesticulation for the best effect. It is over emphatic. It is too redundant generally, not perhaps for a spoken discourse, but for a composition to be read. Some sentences are so obscure that we must attribute their peculiar wording to the printer's carelessness and the proof-reader's also : e. g., the foot of p. 159 : which has no possible meaning. We have marked over a dozen errors of the press and of construction, which should be corrected on the stereotype plates before any fur-

ther impressions are taken. We wish the author would very carefully review his pages. The book is too good not to be better.

Dr. Lord's closing paragraph informs us, much to our pleasure, that we may expect another volume, upon "the labors of the Christian Fathers in founding the new civilization which still reigns among the nations." He will find in that field of study a yet better topic for his scholarly tastes, and his eminently Christian spirit. He will write the lives of those apostolic men with a sympathy for their doctrines and their labors, deeper than a mere intellectual admiration of their heroic careers and pure characters. They will find in him a truthful and an unflinching interpreter. We are glad that we have, in this author, a sturdy and an earnest as well as a popular adherent of a school of literature which does not think it necessary to become pagan in order to be respectable.

7.—*The Guardian Angel*. By OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, author of "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," &c. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

A few months since, we met in our travels, a young man of New England parentage, who had taken Dr. Holmes as his great Apollo. He was as shallow and conceited as his master's ninnies, and he quoted the "Philosopher" and the "Autocrat" as freely as though he thought them inspired. He was embittered against the faith of his parents, and made it his boast that he penned those articles that appeared during the war in a so-called liberal newspaper, against the Christian Commission, whose work he was never tired of ridiculing. This is what Dr. Holmes is trying to do, and in such cases is succeeding in doing, in our New England families. And when we saw this God-forsaken young man, so infected, and so poisoned, by the virus that runs through Dr. Holmes's literary works, we determined to speak of them as they deserve.

Dr. Holmes has finished this new attack upon the faith of his father, with less discredit to himself as a gentleman and a writer, than we at one time apprehended; and we are inclined to think the outcry raised against the book, as some of its more objectionable chapters were issued, may have prevented a worse denouement. Still, the book is full of the fashionable innuendoes and misrepresentations respecting Orthodoxy. The author delights to "wreak himself on expression" when he treats the religion of the founders of his native commonwealth. In "Elsie Venner" he set up for ridicule the Biblical doctrine of "original sin," and in the "Guardian Angel" he treats the physical aspects of that doctrine. In his pre-

face, he says that this is so adroitly done, that "the large majority of those whom his book reaches, will not suspect any thing to harm them beyond the simple facts of the narrative." But Dr. Holmes knows that there is an atmosphere to every book, which may be quite as dangerous as its avowed object.

Having already somewhat freely expressed our indignation at his treatment of the names, and doctrines, and offices, which many Christian people regard sacred, we shall only quote the following from his preface, defiant and apologetic :

"If we can not follow the automatic machinery of nature into the mental and moral world, where it plays its part as much as in the bodily functions without being accused of laying 'all that we are evil in to a divine thrusting on,' we had better return to *our old demonology and reinstate the Leader of the Lower House in his time-honored prerogatives.*"

This, of course, is an absolute denial of the doctrine of a personal Satan ; a doctrine, however offensive to refined tastes, as really taught in the Bible as that of a personal God. Ticknor & Fields must be aware, if Dr. Holmes is not, that all Evangelical churches receive this doctrine as revealed in the Bible. And yet, they claim to be doing no unfair thing in Christian families, to seek to undermine the faith of the young in the teachings of this book. When the *Atlantic* was started, Dr. Stone recommended it in his vestry. Orthodox people have sustained it and take a pride in its success. Is it avowedly, then, in the hands of infidels and pagans, under the garb of scholars?

8.—*Prayers of the Ages.* Compiled by CAROLINE S. WHITMARSH.
Boston : Ticknor & Fields. 1868.

THIS book is rather curious than profitable or instructive. The author's motto, "I believe in the communion of saints," finds singular comment, when we discover that the heathen and Mohammedans enjoy an embrace within this communion. We may well ask : What concord hath Christ with Belial, or what connection hath light with darkness? "The Hebrew Prayers," as they are called in the preface, which have been omitted, would surely have been out of place in such company, although the author may not see it. "To show how the great healers and helpers of the world have prayed, has been my aim in compiling this volume." And so here are prayers "To Jupiter," "To the Dawn," "To Varuna," "To Indra," in the same category with those addressed to the "only living and true God." The principle on which the book is founded, is false to inspiration and to the Christian system. The very classification of heathen prayers to heathen divinities, with petitions to Jehovah, is a

violation of the first commandment in the decalogue, and an outrage upon the Christian public.

In saying this, we do not deny that much good taste and large research is displayed in some portions of the volume. Of modern divines, Theodore Parker and J. F. Clark are quoted each once, Dr. A. C. Thompson, three times, Robertson once, and William E. Channing, four times. If Mr. Beecher's volume had been out in season, probably some selections from his lips would have appeared here.

The volume is very neatly printed.

- 9.—*Scenes from the Life of St. Paul, and their Religious Lessons.*
By the Rev. J. S. Howson, D. D. American Tract Society, Boston.

THE author's labors on the "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," prepared him to write this smaller work, as few others could have done. The subject is richer in material for interesting description and religious edification than the career of any other character, the Saviour alone excepted. The volume contains twelve chapters, and presents the results of much careful study in a brief space and in a popular form. It is an excellent book for Sunday School Libraries and for families not only, but also for any one who has not the larger work of which Dr. Howson was joint-author. With the charm of truth stronger than fiction, it ought to have a wide circulation.

- 10.—*The Forest Boy. A sketch of the Life of Abraham Lincoln.*
For young people. By Z. A. MUDGE. New York: Carlton & Porter.

It is sometimes a misfortune to be great and distinguished; for two reasons. One is that the charm of greatness is apt to be impaired by the biographer's details, and the other is that too many are tempted to become biographers for the probable profits, pecuniary or otherwise. Though but little that is of much importance can be found relating to the life and character of Mr. Lincoln until he was elected to Congress, great pains have been taken to gather up every incident and anecdote that could possibly be tolerated. It may well be assumed that the greater part of what may be written of any man, might also be written essentially of any other man; and thus readers be spared the labor of looking over a vast amount of that which is common in order to find the little which is peculiar. However, in this case even trifles are not only tolerated but eagerly welcomed; and though a pains-taking biographer, who searches the

sources for his material, may be deprived of the full reward of his labors by the cheaper and more superficial works of others, yet we can not but be glad for every book that will acquaint the people, old and young, with the career of Abraham Lincoln from the cradle to the grave. This volume is instructive and interesting for such as have not other accounts of him, and will do much to enable the children and youth to cherish his memory. But we hardly see the propriety of classing it with Sunday school books, inasmuch as there is but very little of it suitable for Sunday reading.

11. — *Visions of Paradise*. An Epic. By DAVID N. LORD. Vol. I. New York: D. N. Lord, 19 West Fourth Street. pp. 415. 1867.

THIS pleasing volume is very much after the manner of the late one by Bickersteth, entitled "Yesterday, To-day and Forever." The pre-millennial views, the versification and the bold, lofty and dreamy visions are quite similar. The characters are God, Christ, angels good and bad, the spirits of just men, and races of bodied beings that did not fall. The work has considerable merit, and shows study, culture and imagination, and is well calculated to meet the tastes of a class of religious readers. The aim of the author is

"To aid readers to juster and more cheering views than are generally entertained, of the life of the redeemed during the period between their death and their resurrection; to present vivid pictures of the vastness, the unity, and the grandeur of God's material empire; to depict in fitting lines the immensity and glory of his moral kingdom; to unfold the work of redemption in its genuine characters; and, finally, to portray and verify the great purposes God has revealed respecting the future of our world and our race."

The visions extend through two hundred and forty four pages (the notes filling one hundred and seventy pages), and through "Book Twelfth"; the author's "Attendant" having narrated events not much past creation, affording ample opportunity for many succeeding volumes.

The reader must expect to find here many things which are not in the Bible, and which make the visions of the old prophets seem quite tame.

The following selections will give some idea of the whole :

"When death's dark form on rushing pinions borne,
Down to my dwelling stooped, and set his seal.
Icy and withering, on my wedded brow;
And night again the earth enshrouding, shed
A fitful slumber on my weary lids;

Upcalled as by some quickening power, the scene
 In a deep dream returned, in shape and hue,
 As when first passing. While supporting her,
 I trembling stood, and watched life's waning light,
 And saw its final gleam expire; methought,
 I too, released from this corporeal shroud,
 Became a separate spirit with a shape
 Airy and winged, and senses higher far,
 Hearing and eye, than in this bodied life.
 Then her emerging quick as thought I saw,
 Out of her pulseless mould, a seraph form,
 Robed in a glistering drapery.

* * * * *

"A moment's deep awed silence; when uprose
 That great archangel and his train, and thus:
 'The sovereign aims and measures God reveals,
 He has in wisdom chosen to achieve
 The restoration of man's fallen line,
 Oft differ wide from what in that dark world
 His children deem; though they possess the large
 And clear-voiced revelations of his word.
 This light and blissful mansion that is now
 Your calm abode, it there is held shall be
 Your paradise through everlasting years.
 But differing far God's gracious purpose. He
 Makes it your dwelling only from death's hour,
 To that great morning's dawn, when Christ shall call
 Your slumbering ashes from the sepulchre,
 To a new shape in incorruptness, light,
 And glory like his own transfigured form.
 Then he shall leave these heavenly realms, and go
 To reign in pomp and majesty divine
 On the new-Eden'd earth, with all his saints
 In beauty vested; and shall there his throne
 Set through eternal ages, and reveal
 His face to them in glory, as he here
 Unveils himself to our adoring sight.

* * * * *

"When centuries of happy progress thus
 Had wheeled their round; the voice of sacred seers
 Proclaimed a youthful pair were soon to be
 Borne from our planet to a distant orb,
 New-built and spacious for their home, and fill
 Its verd'rous realms with chanting worshippers.
 Their names, their persons, parentage, and what
 Clime gave them nurture, long unknown remained.
 In filial reverence and submission all
 Paused, of some sign expectant, that might show

Whose was the lofty office. Deep felt each
The right of God to take, or leave, whom he
Sovereign should please.

“Thus passed ten years in prayer,
And consecration to his parent will;
When, lo, the voice of prophets breathed the names
Of twain in our own native vale, in shape,
Eye, mien, preëminent, and all the sweet
Graces of virtue.”

- 12.—*German Rationalism, in its Rise, Progress and Decline, in relation to Theologians, Scholars, Poets, Philosophers, and the People.* A Contribution to the Church History of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By K. R. HAGENBACK, Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. Edited and Translated by Rev. Wm. Leonhard Gage and Rev. J. H. W. Sheckenberg. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George St., etc. For sale by Gould & Lincoln.

FEW more valuable books come upon our table for notice, and our friend, Rev. Mr. Gage, never gave his German studies a more profitable direction than in assisting to translate and give it to his countrymen. If there is any antidote to the German Rationalism, which is so flooding the land, now let us have it. Such books as this, and Birk's "Bible and Modern Thought," published by the London Religious Tract Society, ought to be in every minister's hand. Why should the latter not be republished by some American Tract Society? We think, being a direct answer to "Essays and Reviews," it is a real and effectual one.

- 13.—*Waiting for the Verdict.* By Mrs. R. H. DAVIS, author of "Life in the Iron Mills," "Margaret Howth," etc. New York: Sheldon & Company. 1868.

THE title of this book is expressive of the patience and expectation of the slave while the problem of the rebellion was in process of solution. The book itself is worthy to rank with the few which have already been written, and which are but the harbingers of many more, doubtless, illustrative of Southern life and scenes among the whites and blacks during the terrible crises which issued in the emancipation of the latter. The field is rich in scenes and incidents of romantic interest, but considerable time must yet elapse before the best results of working it can be realized. It is yet too early for the best novel as well as for the best history. Still, whoever writes in either one line or the other, is almost sure to find a

multitude of readers whose hearts will beat with indignation at the cruelties of the oppressors, and with tender pity at the sufferings of the oppressed.

- 14.—*Thanksgiving; Nemesis of the Day; Helps to the Habit.* By WILLIAM ADAMS, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

THIS book is made up of sermons of the readable class, easily written and familiar, here thrown into chapters under such titles as Daily Journals, Exuberant Goodness, Home, A Cheerful Temper, Happy Mediocrity, &c., covering 372 pages. It is neatly printed, and very cosy and pleasant. For sale by Graves & Young.

- 15.—*The Three Gardens; Eden, Gethsemane and Paradise, or Man's Ruin, Redemption and Restoration.* By WM. ADAMS, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868.

THIS volume is from the same graceful pen as the above, and printed in the same style. It was originally issued some ten or twelve years since, and has been well received. It discusses large subjects in a way to interest the popular mind. It was, probably, constructed as was the previous volume. Also for sale by Graves & Young.

- 16.—*Memorial of the Semi-Centennial Anniversary of the American Colonization Society.* Celebrated at Washington, January 15, 1867. With Documents concerning Liberia. Washington Colonization Society Building. 1867.

WE have perused this elegant volume, of a hundred and ninety two octavo pages, with the deepest interest. The formation of the American Colonization Society, and the founding of the free and independent Republic of Liberia will have a place among the most important events of modern times. The grand results, and that they will be grand we feel assured, belong to the future. It is something that there is a beautiful country to-day, of inexhaustible resources for commercial purposes, with a free government, Christian institutions, and schools for all, where the black man has all the privileges and immunities which belong to the truest manhood, where he is sovereign, and there is none to challenge his right. It is still more that the highest Christian civilization has planted itself on the shores of Africa, giving promise of a greater work for Christ on that beautiful continent within the next fifty years than could be accomplished in centuries by missionaries from the United

States and England. We shall refer to this volume more fully in our next issue.

17.—*The Art of English Composition*, and *The Art of Discourse*.

THESE are two valuable books for young students, by Prof. H. N. Day, and published by Chas. Scribner & Co., New York. They will be found to be clear and simple and yet thorough treatises in the department of composition and rhetoric.

18.—*A Memoir of the Life and Labors of Francis Wayland, D. D., LL.D., Late President of Brown University*. By his sons, FRANCIS and H. L. WAYLAND. New York; Sheldon & Co.

DR. WAYLAND was one of those decided and masculine spirits that leave their distinctive mark upon their time, in religion, education, and literature. These volumes, for there are two, record in narrative, reminiscence, and correspondence how he attained his influence and did his work. In the late years of his life he was greatly impressed with the importance of more evangelical preaching. Some of his correspondence on this subject is very interesting. We commend the books, which are for sale by Graves & Young, to all ministers, and especially to young ones. For ourselves we esteem them of great value.

19.—*The Diary of a Milliner*. By BELLE OTIS. New York; Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

RACY and piquant and truthful, this little volume holds the mirror up to nature admirably. Belle Otis sees her own faults as well as other people's.

20.—*Hymns*. Selected from FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D.D. Northampton: Bridgman & Childs. 1867.

FABER writes some of the very best hymns of praise in our language. Here are some selected from his various issues of "Catholic Hymns," for Protestant use. The volume is very nicely executed, and deserves a large sale.

We have some good hymns written by Mrs. Stowe, Miss Kimball and Theodore Tilton, but in simplicity and fervor and a kind of heavenly fire, these all may sit at the feet of Faber.

ARTICLE IX.

THE ROUND TABLE.

PERSONAL. We closed, with the last volume, our connection as proprietors and editors of this *Review*, after seven years of labor in it. We were not mistaken in supposing that there was a place for it, and in looking back we can see that there was a good work for it to perform. Our success in doing that work is our abundant reward. The memories of those seven years' labors are very pleasant, and with many regrets we close them. But it is our pleasure to leave the *Review* in the hands of our former associates, widely and favorably known in the theological and literary world. While our personal connection with this publication ceases, our deep interest and good wishes will abide with it.*

W. BARROWS.

J. C. BODWELL.

J. T. TUCKER.

EDITORIAL. The remaining editors deeply regret that removals and overwork break in upon one of the most pleasant and profitable relations that are ever formed among men. Through all our editorial labors we have rejoiced in a friendship such as that of David with Jonathan. Its preciousness, like its effects upon us, will continue forever. We are somewhat comforted with the assurance that this staunch trio of able and valiant laborers for Christ will continue to aid us by their contributions to these pages.

Yet we should hardly be reconciled to our great loss were it not for the unifying and consolidating changes which have given to us the sympathy and co-operation of our whole denomination. The action of our National Council in Boston, the happy consolidation of two of our oldest Congregational papers, and the union of two of our publication societies, are evidences of a wide and general preparation for the closing up of the ranks of Christians and an earnest entering upon the great work of the Church against the bolder skepticism, errors and vices of this era. Our denominational journals are now conducted upon broad and tolerant platforms, fully open to the writers and workers of every minor shade of opinion, furnishing a fair and open field, such as must satisfy all true men. It seems to be the settled purpose of our whole denomination to hold fast unswervingly to all the great principles of our Puritan

faith and polity. None could desire stronger and bolder articles in favor of doctrinal study and doctrinal preaching and writing than have appeared of late in the *Congregationalist and Recorder*, in the *Advance* and even in the *Independent*, utterly repudiating and trampling upon the idea of separating religion and religious work from theology and doctrines. Surely the *Recorder* in its palmy days could have said nothing bolder and more to the purpose, nor could it have said what it had to say upon half so wide a field.

The way is, therefore, all prepared for a more united and effective work than Congregationalists have ever put forth. Joining heartily with all the other agencies and instrumentalities of our churches, the *Congregational Review* (now changed back again to a bi-monthly for increased vivacity and efficiency) will aim to supply the most important, timely, stimulating, and attractive reading for all our ministers, churches and families. With the stronger theological and religious discussions, lighter, literary, miscellaneous and other articles will be mingled; with the intention of keeping our readers well posted in regard to all the important subjects of thought, discussion, benevolent enterprise, books and errors of the day. We will not hesitate to open our pages to a serial story, providing we can best accomplish our objects in that way. The *Review* will be in full sympathy with all the working life and benevolent enterprise of our churches, reporting progress and discussing any of the new questions that relate to Missions, Home Evangelization, Lay Effort, Sabbath School, and other interests. Our aim is to combat error and sin; to vindicate and enforce truth and duty, to make progress on the right side of all the moral questions which are soon to come before the people of this country for settlement. As such the *Congregational Review* appeals to all our ministers and churches for a candid reading, and for helpful coöperation.

WE have ventured to undertake a literal translation of this wonderful

HYMN OF HILDEBERT TO THE FATHER.

Alpha et Ω , magne Deus!

Eli! Eli! Deus meus,—

Cujus virtus, totum posse;

Cujus sensus, totum nosse;

Cujus esse, summum bonum;

Cujus opus, quicquid bonum.

Super cuncta, subter cuncta;

Extra cuncta, intra cuncta.

Intra cuncta, nec inclusus;

Thou art Alpha and Omega,

Art my own, my great Jehovah;

Thine the power, all things doing,

Thine the wisdom, all things knowing;

In thy being, perfect blessing,

In thy work, all good possessing.

All things over, under all things,

Both without, and within all things.

Within all things, not included;

Extra cuncta, nec exclusus ;
 Super cuncta, nec elatus,
 Subter cuncta, nec substratus.

Super totus, presidendo ;
 Suter totus, sustinendo ;
 Extra totus, complectendo ;
 Intra totus es implendo.

Intra, nunquam coarctaris :
 Extra, nunquam dilataris ;
 Super, nullo sustentaris ;
 Subter, nullo fatigaris.

Mundum movens, non moveris ;

Locum tenens, non teneris ;
 Tempus mutans, non mutaris ;
 Vaga firmans, non vagaris.
 Vis externa, vel necesse,
 Non alternat, tuum esse.

Heri nostrum, eras et pridem,
 Semper tibi nunc et idem.
 Tuum, Deus' hodiernum
 Indivisum, sempiternum ;
 In hoc, totum previdisti,
 Totum simul perfecisti
 Ad exemplar summæ mentis,
 Formam præstans elementis.

Without all things, not excluded ;
 Over all things, not above them,
 Under all things, not beneath them.

Wholly over, in presiding ;
 Wholly under, in sustaining ;
 Without wholly, in embracing,
 Within wholly, thou, in filling.

Within, never aught restraining,
 Without, never aught constraining ;
 Over all, yet naught sustains thee ;
 Under all, no burden pains thee.

Moving worlds, yet nothing moves
 thee,

In thy place, yet nothing holds thee ;
 Changing ages, yet unchanging ;
 Fixing wand'ers, never wand'ring,
 Pow'r external, power essential,
 Still thy being never varies.

What we call our past and future,
 These to thee, the same are always ;
 Thine the present, undivided,
 Thine the present, still eternal ;
 In this all things are provided,
 All things in it, fixed, decided,
 Moulded at thine own election,
 Brought by thee unto perfection.

THE BOSTON ADVERTISER, in giving a notice of Hamerton's "Painter's Camp," quotes from it the following traditionary story as something new. It may be found in an old French Cyclopædia of Anecdotes, published in Paris in 1857 :

"In parting with these two jolly priests, let me cite an anecdote which is narrated of one of them. Being one day at the table of his bishop. *monseigneur* deigned to ask his opinion of the wine. '*Bonus vinum*,' said the priest. The bishop was rather surprised at such an exhibition of weak Latinity, but kindly said nothing. Later in the evening he again asked the priest's opinion of the wine. but this time of far superior quality. '*Bonum vinum*,' answered the priest. 'May I ask,' said the bishop, 'why, when I first referred to your judgment, you made *vinum*, masculine, whereas now you conform to the common practice, and make it neuter !'

" '*A petit vin, petit Latin*,' said the *curé* "

This is the original story :

"*A bon vin, bon latin*. Ce proverbe peu connu merite de l'être. Le premier président du parlement de Paris, M. de Lamoignon, était en peine d'avoir un bibliothécaire. Il s'adressa pour cela à M. Hermant, recteur de l'Université, qui lui indiqua M. Baillet, son compatriote. Le

président voulut le connaître. Il le fait inviter à dîner; Baillet s'y rend, mais, s'apercevant qu'il est entouré de pédants qui veulent faire les savants avec lui, il ne répond que par monsyllabes aux divers questions qu'il lui fait. On lui demande, en latin, comment il trouve le vin? Il était mauvais, il répond *bonus*. Aussitôt de rire et d'en conclure, comme on l'avait déjà senti, que le candidat n'est qu'un sot. Au dessert, on sert du vin d'une meilleure qualité, et pour se donner de nouveau le plaisir de rire, on renouvelle la question de la qualité du vin. Baillet répond: *Bonum*. Oh! oh! ah! ah! eh! vous voilà redevenu bon latiniste!—Oui, à bon vin, bon latin."

If Hamerton's sketches, as an artist, are no more original than his anecdotes, we think he never will become famous except on the subjects of the "old masters."

THE PAN-HODGE-PODGE. In these days of evangelical alliances, High and Low Church conventions, Presbyterian unions, Old and New School re-unions, and consolidations of "no-hell" and no-Saviour sects,—who shall be surprised at similar movements on the part of those outside of all evangelical denominations and schools, and all unevangelical sects named and nameless? The Pan-Anglican Synod obtained at once a world-wide notoriety, and the Pan-Presbyterian Convention was hardly less fortunate; but for some reason, obvious or mysterious, the Pan-Dowdy has not become so widely and so well known as it deserved.

This was called by a Committee of three, appointed at "a private conference of some fifty or sixty gentlemen and ladies" in February last. The Committee consisted of O. B. Frothingham, Wm. J. Potter and Rowland Connor. It was held on the 30th of May, at Horticultural Hall, in Boston, the only city, of course, where *such* a private conference could have spontaneously originated. It was a conglomeration of various elements, whose affinities for each other were of the negative sort, but which were classified, nevertheless, by the president, O. B. Frothingham, under two general heads: the extreme left-wing Unitarians, the radical Universalists, the modern Spiritists, the outlawed Quakers, and those who have distanced the Progressive Friends, "satisfying the demands of Christendom"; and the liberal Jews, the technical Come-outers, the anti-religious scientists, the transcendental humanists, and the "universal, comprehensive, absolute" intuitionists—of whom Ralph Waldo Emerson is the genus, representing the world "outside of Christendom." Logically the president must be understood as meaning by this latter class, Pagans.

The object was "to consider the conditions, wants, and prospects of Free Religion in America"! Now America is supposed to be a

great country. The scope of Free Religion is territorially immense. Just how much territory is already under the influence of Free Religion does not appear. Whether there is yet any such thing as Free Religion is not clear to those outside of these outsiders. The terms of the call of the Pan-Hodge-podge leave the matter in doubt. Whether the "conditions" mean the actual states and phases of Free Religion, or the essential pre-requisites to its existence, makes a slight difference. The same is true of its "wants and prospects."

Whether ideal or real, theoretical or actual, in progress or yet to be undertaken, however, what is Free Religion? To answer this question, it is necessary to interrogate the Pan-Hodge-podge. In the opening speech the president announced that "Religion is not Christian; religion is human." Here are the negative and the positive poles of religion. But religion is the last stage of development from various points of departure, as Romanism, Protestantism, Liberalism. Its development is centripetal on these lines towards something more general in which these elements coalesce, and that is Christianity. But that is not the ultimate; it is only the immediate prelude to religion. So far the definition is clear as mortar. For further elucidation we must summon the subordinates.

The come-outer from Universalism, Rev. Henry Blanchard, declared himself a radical, but came to the Pan-Hodge-podge supposing it would be composed "of those who desired to be called Christians." He had left behind all those who "believe the Bible because, accepting science as highest authority, they do not find the Bible, fairly interpreted, clashing with this, and so accept final universal salvation as a doctrine based on the dicta of science to-day." He had lost all "hope for any assistance from an organization so compact, sectarian, intolerant." And even Liberal Christianity was too illiberal for him.

The "outlaw" from the Friends, Mrs. Lucretia Mott, represented no one but herself. She rejoiced in the general spirit of freethinking, and in the confusion consequent among the old organizations. But her speech culminated in the ominous threat that the "monopoly in excluding woman from the pulpit will have to be broken up."

The representative of Spiritism, Robert Dale Owen, made a very long speech, showing what spiritists do not, and what they do believe, not only in general, but in such a series of minute details as to be a ludicrous bearding of the Pan-Hodge-podge in respect of its pervading hatred of creeds. He advocated spiritism as the needed haven for all denominations and sects, but frankly admitted that in communion with spirits there is danger of contracting "a

habit which tends to unsettle the judgment and produce an abnormal condition of feeling and of mind." The object to be gained, however, justified the risk.

Then a man from the extreme left of Unitarianism, Rev. John Weiss, rejected every fact and story and suggestion of Spiritism, advanced "far beyond any form of Orthodox or Liberal belief," and declared: "That free religion in America depends upon the way in which your souls press onward to find the presence of God in America; to find the ever-present inspiration in your minds, and in your hearts this moment, while you stand in that aisle this morning." His rhetoric speaks for itself, if not for the general culture of the Pan-Hodge-podge. However it serves to disclose the fact that free religionists generally are as yet without the presence of God in America.

The *Progressive Friend*, Oliver Johnson, presented the "Exposition" of principles on which the Society to which he belonged was based. And as he uttered no caveat, he is responsible for the sentiment that "A church which finds itself under the necessity of expelling immoral persons from its pale by a formal vote, is no longer worthy to be called Christian."

Another speaker, Francis E. Abbot, "discarded that principle of authority upon which all organized 'Christian' churches are built," reiterated the stale slander of the opposition of religion to science, distinguishing religion as a "development into the spiritual ideal of gravitation towards an infinite spiritual Life," and science as the interpreter of this and every other fact. He believed the one creed common to all radicals to be "faith in humanity." This is "religion without superstition." This was the "new wine" with which they were drunk, and it was "fast bursting the old bottles." The mixture of figures raises the query, whether they guzzled the spilling contents or were themselves bursting!

The next speaker, D. A. Wasson, defined religion as the "absolute affirmation of Spirit, reflected in the spontaneous worship of humanity," and very dramatically declared: "For one, I ape no more the brute vernacular of the world nor ask that to instruct my soul what it shall say; but rather come to teach that the mother-tongue of Spirit."

After this exhibition of pedantry, assumption and metaphysical fog, followed the literati of the assembly. One, T. W. Higginson, lamented that "the same noble aspirations and inspirations" of "twenty years ago" had so far failed that he seemed to see no results represented in this Pan-Hodge-podge "except one grand reality,

the persistent soul of Lucretia Mott." It is surprising that such an acute Spiritist did not also see the soul of Theodore Parker. But the explanation may be that the master as well as the surviving pupil thought all organizations unwise, and that the best policy was for every one to stand alone, because then he would be supported by "the vast sympathies of the world" behind him. The other, R. W. Emerson, modestly announced "that the churches are outgrown; that the creeds are outgrown." He meant that a church is "less" than the individual, especially if, like himself, he is "apprised of the Divine presence within his own mind." He was very brief, doubtless on account of the incapacity of Horticultural Hall.

If these various sentiments be put together, perhaps they will appear to be entirely consistent with the character of the Pan-Hodge-podge; but they will furnish no clear idea of Free Religion, except freedom to destroy every principle of true religion, and every distinctively Christian organization. Hatred of Christianity is the one bond of sympathy which enabled every speaker to give to all the rest the right hand of fellowship, while he differed from all the rest in every other sentiment. This is a strange bond of union, and to ordinary and sane minds a kind of forlorn hope. Yet one of the speakers was "thrilled" by the sight of "the representatives of so many different opinions," and "by the hope of union of all devout men." It is a pity that "devoutness" was not inserted at the end of every remark that "brought down the house" with that solemn and affecting emotion.

The Pan-Hodge-podge reminds one of "the happy family" exhibited to all the curious, for a consideration, by the great humbugger. And the prodigious boasting about science and development "from below," naturally suggests the inquiry as to what anomaly in nature must have been the last stage upward before the Pan-dowdy. The showman's wonder was artificial, and therefore not the proper solution of the problem. But somewhere "in America," it is said, the prairie-dog and an owl and a rattlesnake burrow together. The bond of sympathy and union is supposed to be the instinct of defence against an enemy or enemies common to all. By adopting the scientific method of the free religionists—that of manufacturing hypotheses and calling them *data*, it is obvious that the development theory is here very wonderfully developed.

The Pan-Hodge-podge is a charge in convention that the religion of the Bible is not free! There is nothing new in the charge, but only in the form of it. It is made and echoed and re-echoed in some pulpits, on many platforms, in more papers, magazines and volumes, with abundant complacency on the part of the "ring" at

the quiet non-resistance of multitudes of hearers and readers. But what is more free than the religion of Christ: and what is dearer to his followers? How long will intelligent Christian families tolerate the lecturing and literature of free religionists who thus aim to deceive the very elect? How long will the Christian community persist in the gratification of prurient curiosity at the risk of moral and spiritual ruin! Are not the hatred and the weapons of the self-styled "free religionists" against the citadel of divine truth sufficiently obvious to demand the united strength and influence of the friends of morality and religion in defence? Not that the church of Christ is in danger of extinction, for the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; but many of the members of the church, and their households, are in danger.

"EACH IN HIS OWN TONGUE." One part of the scene at Pentecost was re-enacted at the late Paris Exposition. The dwellers out of every nation under heaven have heard, each in his own tongue wherein he was born, the wonderful works of God, in his glorious Gospel, which, as the grandest and best thing in the world, well deserved the prominent place it held at the World's Fair. The Catholics and all the grosser idolaters have been constrained, as upon a great stage, to contrast their religions, which appeal to the eye and the senses, with Protestantism, which appeals to the understanding and the conscience.

From the Bible Stand the Holy Scriptures, beautifully printed in fifteen different languages, were freely distributed by earnest Christian men who could converse in all these languages. An Englishman, a Frenchman, a German, a converted Jew, a Russian, an Italian, a Spaniard who was the fellow prisoner of Matamoras, all had their place about the Stand and were all eager to give the Bible and a saving knowledge of it to every creature. Says an eye witness:

"Mr J. Alexander distributed, even before the opening of the Exhibition, more than 12,000 portions of Scripture among the workmen employed in the construction of the building. He informed me, in answer to a question which I put to him, that nearly 2,000,000 detached books of the Bible had, since the inauguration of the Champ de Mars Palace, been handed to the passers by, of every nation, of every country, Cretes and Arabians, Chinese and Abyssinians, Turks and Europeans. To the Spanish Papist as well as to the French Voltairean; to the fanatic Brahmin, as well as to the indifferent Protestant; to the Sabbath breaker, as well as to the faithful observer of Mohammedanism, have these little books been distributed. On Easter day, 28,551 portions, and on Pentecost Sunday, 34,000 were given away.

"Immense has already been the success of this work. At first, numbers of skeptical Parisians accepted the little book with a smile of contempt and mockery, or else with a feeling of surprise, thinking they were mere prospectuses. But this did not last long, and the people now accept with profound respect and deep thanks these little volumes. Among foreigners especially this mission has had important results. On the day of the distribution of the prizes, the men on duty who kept the line, as well as the officers in command even broke their ranks, in their eagerness to accept the Gospels distributed by the English emissary from the Bible stand. The general in command of the troops gave them permission to receive the books, and a thousand were given among them. Seven hundred privates have daily free admittance to the Palace, and the first duty the distributor attends to is that each man should have the Gospel. Priests even are constantly seen to approach the stand. A *cure*, belonging to a Paris church, who had received the Gospel, returned the following day, and applied for three hundred. The Prince of Wales, the Grand Duke Constantine, the King of Prussia, the Princess of Prussia and the Viceroy of Egypt have one and all paid a visit to the Bible stand and left it taking away with them not only the Old Testament but the Gospel in fifteen different languages. It was noticed that, as the Viceroy drove away from the Exhibition he was reading one of these little volumes. M. Haussman, the Prefet de la Seine, takes a great interest in the institution. The Emperor himself walked thoughtfully round the Bible kiosk, apparently amazed at the eagerness with which the people were seeking the Word of God. Hundreds of Catholic priests have with thankfulness accepted the books. On one occasion, two Roman Catholic curates came up together, and were accosted by a bigoted lady, a Papist, who spoke bitterly of the stand being a hot bed of heretical propaganda, and warned the crowd not to touch any of the little books. When she saw the priests accepting them, she expressed the utmost astonishment, and exclaimed: 'It is a Protestant book.' 'No,' observed one of the priests, 'tis neither Protestant nor Catholic—c'est veritablement la parole de Dieu.'

TOO MUCH HUMILITY. We pencil a note of interrogation against the following most singular deliverance, some weeks since, in a number of the *Nation* (N. Y.): "We have republics of longer duration than theirs [the ancient world], but none which have done more for humanity and progress, or endowed the race with a better stock of ennobling memories and ideas."

Our query might very well have been an exclamation-point of wonder at such wild writing as this. In the first place, our existing republics have not lasted longer than those of Rome and Greece. But, more important than this, the self-depreciation of the above judgment is as absurd as is much of the extravagant self-laudation with which we are more familiar. The strange assertion does not admit of counter argument; it is too prodigiously false for this. You can

only deny it, and let it pass. The writer has overstepped his object. This seems to be to expose the ultra materialism of the age—the ambition of brick and mortar, railroad and steamship, staple and fancy stock prosperity, which is running away with our people. But he does not show a proper sobriety, or intelligence when he tells us that :

“ Modern society has been preaching the Christian religion for eight hundred years, and yet only a very small fraction of the population of the globe has been reached by it, and of this small fraction only an infinitesimally small proportion really and sincerely believes in it. In the education of children the progress made, too, has been lamentably small; in fact the teacher of our day, considering the material facilities placed at his disposal, has made very slight advances on his mediæval predecessor. The condition of women and the mode of regulating the relations of the sexes is almost as tough a problem, and is looked at with despair by almost as many minds now as in the declining days of Rome.”

There is a modicum of truth in all this, and no more. Its spirit is not good. It is an unjust aspersion of the modern Christian work, which, defective as it may be, is not open to any such disparagement. It reads like an attempt to bolster up paganism at the expense of Christianity. Here is more of it, the peroration of an eulogium of the old Roman state :

“ It must be remembered, too, that this was done without printing, without railroads, without telegraphs, and, in the main, without Christianity; done by dint of toil and endeavor and moral force. None of the achievements of any modern nation can for a moment be compared with it; and modern nations are still so far from being able to rival it that the moral power of Rome is a secret over which scholars continue to argue, but of which no satisfactory solution has yet been offered.”

Is the *Nation* also going back to the Pantheon and “ the light of nature ” ?

A QUESTION OF COLOR. An article, in a recent number of the *Westminster Review*, on “ Mimicry, and other protective resemblances among Animals,” is full of curious information illustrative of the position that the colors of animals, birds, and insects are arranged with an eye to their protection from enemies of various sorts. The field of research is novel and rich. The writer makes a wide induction and establishes his point, as we think, satisfactorily. As we enjoyed his pages, we could not avoid reflecting upon the charming and forcible proof thus furnished to the truth with which all nature teems, that God not only takes care of the oxen (as the Bible says) but also of every living thing.

Not so, however, with our reviewer; for his paper is got up for the direct purpose of defeating this to us so obvious and inevitable conclusion. He writes in the interests of the Darwinian hypothesis, and professes to find, in these beneficent adjustments, an argument with which to rule out "the direct volition of the Creator." That the polar animals are white, and the lions and other beasts of sandy Africa are tawny, and the myriad insects are colored like their habitual vegetable and other surroundings—and all this to guard them from dangerous assailants—is attributable in his regard, not to a divine foresight and determination, but, to what? It is not "those incalculable combinations of laws which we term chance"; it is not "the special creation of each imitative form"; it is not "the action of similar conditions of existence for some of the cases, and of the laws of hereditary descent and the reversion to ancestral forms for others." These explanations are considered as inadequate. What then is the true philosophy of this beautiful and benevolent arrangement? "The general law of 'Utility,' the advocacy of which, in its broadest sense, we owe almost entirely to Mr. Darwin," is the key to the mystery. The "fittest" survives, the unfittest perishes. Hence, the fact that animate nature is thus protected by its many-hued colorings and other contrivances from invasion, from the incubating bird to the polar bear.

But is this the end of the solution? Who determines the *fitness* and preserves it? Whose will and providence lies back of this "general law of utility," enacting it in the beginning and guarding its permanency? The contrast between the accuracy of this writer's observation and the weakness of his logic, is surprising. His theory of "variation and natural selection," as accounting for the assignment of animal colors, and the arts of "mimicry" by which some creatures escape destruction, carries to our mind the same kind of absurdity as if some wise and admirable manuscript should be ascribed to the pen which wrote it, without a guiding hand or intelligence behind it. We agree with the reviewer in his estimate of the fascination there is "in this wide and picturesque domain of nature" which he traverses; but we do not agree with him in his feeble and poor deductions from this study. We prefer the doctrine of Jesus Christ: "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? And not one of them is forgotten before God."

OUR readers will find it to their profit to consult the advertising pages of this *Review*, as we insert only from the very best dealers in such goods as our readers are peculiarly interested to know about.